Reward Processing in Children with Psychotic-like Experiences

Authors

Jasmine Harju-Seppänen[1,2]
Haritz Irizar[2,3]
Elvira Bramon[2]
Sarah-Jayne Blakemore[4],
Liam Mason[1, 5 *]
Vaughan Bell[1,6 *]

Affiliations

1. Research Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University College London, London, UK
2. Division of Psychiatry, University College London, London, UK
3. Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, USA
4. Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge, UK
5. Max Planck University College London Centre for Computational Psychiatry and Ageing Research, University College London, London, United Kingdom
6. South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

* Joint last authors

Corresponding author

Vaughan Bell (Vaughan.Bell@ucl.ac.uk)

Abstract

Alterations to striatal reward pathways have been identified in individuals with psychosis. They are hypothesised to be a key mechanism that generates psychotic symptoms through the production of aberrant attribution of motivational salience and are proposed to result from accumulated childhood adversity and genetic risk, making the striatal system hyper-responsive to stress. However, few studies have examined whether children with psychotic-like experiences (PLEs) also exhibit these alterations, limiting our understanding of how differences in reward processing relate to hallucinations and delusional ideation in childhood. Consequently, we examined whether PLEs and PLE-related distress were associated with reward-related activation in the nucleus accumbens (NAcc). The sample consisted of children (N = 6,718) from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study aged 9-10 years who had participated in the Monetary Incentive Delay (MID) task in functional MRI. We used robust mixed-effects linear regression models to investigate the relationship between PLEs and NAcc activation during the reward anticipation and reward outcome stages of the MID task. Analyses were adjusted for gender, household income, ethnicity, depressive symptoms, movement in the scanner, pubertal development, scanner ID, subject and family ID. There was no reliable association between PLEs and alterations to anticipation-related or outcome-related striatal reward processing. We discuss the implications for developmental models of psychosis and suggest a developmental delay model of how PLEs may arise at this stage of development.

Introduction

Psychotic-like experiences (PLEs) include delusion-like beliefs and hallucinations that remain below the threshold for psychotic disorder. PLEs are relatively common in childhood (Linscott and Van Os, 2013) with a median prevalence of 17% among children aged 9–12 years and 7.5% among those aged 13–18 years (Kelleher et al., 2012a). Even during childhood however, they are a predictor of later transition to psychosis (Fisher et al., 2013; Healy et al., 2019a; Poulton et al., 2000) and poor physical and mental health outcomes across the lifespan (Davies et al., 2018; Healy et al., 2019b; Kelleher et al., 2012; Trotta et al., 2020).

It is unclear how childhood PLEs relate to established neurocognitive mechanisms for adult psychosis. One hypothesis is that both adult and childhood PLEs are associated with altered striatal dopamine (MacManus et al., 2012). In the developmental risk factor model, dysregulated striatal dopamine is cited as a final common pathway where genetic risk and developmental adversity converge and lead to psychosis via the generation of aberrant salience (Howes and Kapur, 2009; Murray et al., 2017) – a process where typically innocuous experiences are assigned heighted motivational salience due to misfiring of striatal dopamine leading to delusions and perceptual aberrations. Indeed, neuroimaging studies on reward processing in psychosis risk states and prodromal periods indicate that dysregulation of striatal dopamine is detectable before the onset of frank psychotic disorder (reviewed in Howes et al., 2020). Initial evidence suggests that there is an earlier association between dysregulated striatal reward processing and psychotic-like experiences in 14-19 year-old adolescents (Papanastasiou et al., 2018).

However, it is still not clear if altered striatal reward processing that predicts psychosis and psychosis-risk in older individuals would necessarily explain the presentation of PLEs at a younger age. This is important because childhood is a crucial point of risk divergence for PLEs potentially indicating an opportunity for early intervention. An estimated 75–90% of psychotic experiences during childhood and adolescence are transitory (Rubio et al., 2012; van Os et al., 2009). Those whose PLEs do not resolve have particularly poor outcomes (Calkins et al., 2017; Downs et al., 2013) with distress related to PLEs at age 12 adding predictive value for poor outcome later in life (Sullivan et al., 2020). Consequently, understanding whether dysregulated reward processing is associated with PLEs and PLE-related-distress during earlier childhood could provide important evidence for the presence of early disruption to a key causal mechanism for later psychosis. The aim of the current study was therefore to examine whether PLEs and PLE-related distress in childhood is associated with alterations to striatal reward processing.

Reward processing consists of both reward anticipation and reward evaluation and that these functions of the reward system dissociate (Schultz, 2002). The monetary incentive delay (MID) task was designed to distinguish these functions when used in functional magnetic imaging studies (fMRI) studies (Knutson et al., 2000). It has been used extensively in psychosis research and meta-analysis of relevant fMRI studies provide strong evidence for striatal reward system dysregulation in adults with frank psychosis (Radua et al., 2015). Additional studies have also found evidence for these alterations in antipsychotic naïve patients with schizophrenia (Nielsen

et al., 2012), and in adults with PLEs (Wotruba et al., 2014). Evidence from concurrent fMRI and positron emission tomography (PET) indicates that changes to dopamine transport underlie changes in fMRI reward system-related activation during the MID (Dubol et al., 2018), suggesting that fMRI studies of the MID task are a reliable proxy for alterations to reward-related dopamine function. Studies with children indicate that the paradigm is valid for measuring reward processing in this age group (Dougherty et al., 2018).

Small sample sizes and lack of representative sampling are a challenge for fMRI studies (Turner et al., 2018) and this has been cited as a particular issue for neuroimaging studies of children (Herting et al., 2018). Here, we aimed to test whether PLEs or PLE-related distress was associated with dysregulated reward-processing in the left and right nucleus accumbens (NAcc) during childhood by examining the association between activation during the fMRI MID task in a large (N=6,900+) sample of 9–10-year-olds, who were part of the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study (Garavan et al., 2018). The ABCD study is an ongoing cohort study including more than 11,000 children and includes extensive social, cognitive and developmental measures. It includes demographics, measures of PLEs and PLE-related distress and, in over half of children, the MID task in fMRI.

Consequently, we aimed to test whether PLEs or PLE-related distress could be explained by dysregulated striatal reward processing by examining the association between NAcc activation during the fMRI monetary incentive delay task in a large (N=6,900+) sample of 9–10-year-olds. We tested both anticipation-related and outcome-related reward processing in the left and right NAcc while controlling for potential confounders.

Methods

Sample

The ABCD dataset (release 3.0; https://abcdstudy.org/) includes 11,878 children aged 9-10 years (Volkow et al., 2018). This is a longitudinal dataset being collected at 21 sites across the US. Full details of recruitment are described in Garavan et al. (2018). Institutional review board approval was obtained for each site before data collection and all parents provided written informed consent in addition to assent from the participants (Clark et al., 2018).

Data from participants was excluded based on the following criteria: having a psychiatric diagnosis (N = 1973), not completing the Prodromal Questionnaire (N = 12), taking psychotropic medication (N = 1032), not completing the MID task in the scanner (N = 1030), insufficient performance on the task (N= 573), missing motion data (N = 455), missing fMRI data (N = 27), and if reward-related activation in the nucleus accumbens was more than three standard deviations from the mean (N = 223 for reward anticipation; N = 123 for reward outcome), leaving N = 6,718 who contributed to either the final anticipation or outcome analysis.

Measures

Psychotic-like experiences

Psychotic-like experiences were measured using the Prodromal Questionnaire – Brief Child Version (Heeringa and Berglund, 2020), a modified version of the Prodromal Questionnaire Brief Version (PQ-B) (Loewy et al., 2011) – a self-report measure for psychosis risk syndromes. The PB-QC is a 21-item questionnaire that measures unusual perceptions and sensations, ideas of reference, affective changes, unusual beliefs, or abnormally suspicious thoughts, and associated distress. The PQ-B consists of two parts: the first asks whether the individual has had any of the listed psychotic-like thoughts, feelings and experiences, with an overall score ranging from 0-21. If they answer yes, participants also indicate how related distressing in the second part (from 1-5). A subset of six items were selected to represent analogues of positive symptoms of psychosis (thought interference, visual hallucination, auditory hallucination, two items for paranoia and bizarre beliefs). PLE types were derived from this variable, where participants were categorised as having no PLEs, non-distressing PLEs, or distressing PLEs. Additional analyses used total sum of PLEs and PLE-related distress.

Monetary Incentive Delay task

The Monetary Incentive Delay task (Knutson et al., 2000) measures the anticipation and receipt of rewards and losses. Participants are presented with an incentive cue (2000ms) at the beginning of each trial (Win $5, Win $0.20, Lose $0.20, Lose $5 or $0-no money at stake), followed by a jittered anticipation event (lasting 1500- 4000ms). Participants then need to respond to a variable target (150-500ms), in order to either win or avoid losing money. In the ABCD study, participants are presented with 40 reward (20 small reward, 20 large reward) and 40 loss anticipation trials (20 small loss, 20 large loss), 20 no money anticipation trials, and feedback trials (Casey et al., 2018b). Performance on the task is individualised, and the initial response time is based on participant performance during a practice session of the task prior to entering the scanner. Task performance is calculated as the average reaction time on correct trials, plus two standard deviations. Task difficulty is adjusted to reach a 60% accuracy rate. Participants who did not reach acceptable performance in the task were excluded from analysis (indexed by whether all trial types resulted in more than three events for both positive and negative feedback), as well as those whose NAcc activity was above or below three standard deviations. Validation behavioural and imaging data from the ABCD MID task in typically developing children has previously been reported (Cao et al., 2019; Casey et al., 2018a).

Imaging acquisition

The primary outcome was reward-related activation during the MID task from the left and right NAcc. Full details on imaging acquisition is reported in Casey et al. (2018), information on pre-processing in Hagler et al. (2019), and is summarised here. Imaging data was collected across sites using multi-channel coils and multiband echo planar imaging acquisition. Scanning included a fixed order of localiser, T1- and T2-weighted images, resting state, and diffusion-weighted imaging. Three tasks (MID task, stop signal, and emotional n-back) were completed in an order randomised across participants. Blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) images were acquired using gradient EPI with standardised acquisition parameters. Left and right

NAcc regions of interest were derived from subcortical segmentation using FreeSurfer 5.3.0 (Fischl, 2012). Task-related activation was using the general linear model in AFNI 3dDeconvolve and were available as contrast beta weights. The contrasts used in this study were “large reward vs. no money” and “small reward vs. no money” for reward anticipation activity, and “all reward positive vs. negative feedback” for reward outcome activity.

Covariates

Sex, household income, parental education, and ethnicity were included as covariates owing to their association with psychosis risk (Jongsma et al., 2020; Morgan et al., 2009; Murphy et al., 2020). Depressive symptoms were measured using the Kiddie Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia (KSADS-5). The ABCD study used a recently validated and computerised version of the KSADS-5 (Kobak et al. 2013). The following depressive symptoms were added to create a depression score: depressed mood, anhedonia, and irritability. Depression is included as a potential confounder due to its association with reduced activation during the monetary incentive delay task (Takamura et al., 2017). Pubertal development was included as a potential confounder due to associations between reward processing and puberty (Ladouceur et al., 2019) using the Pubertal Development Scale (Petersen et al., 1988). Child-provided data was used as the primary measure of pubertal stage and missing scores were supplemented by parent-reported information. Subject ID, family ID and scanner ID were included as random-effects covariates (Heeringa and Berglund, 2020). Subject ID was nested within family ID.

Statistical Analysis

We conducted two main analyses to investigate the association between PLEs (none, presence of any non-distressing PLEs and presence of any distressing PLEs) and reward-related activation in the NAcc using multi-level regression analyses. We tested for evidence of heteroscedasticity in the data, and due to its presence, estimated the effects of the predictor variables using robust mixed effects linear regression models (Koller, 2016).

For all analyses, we initially tested for a minimally adjusted association between PLE type (presence of distressing and presence of non-distressing PLEs) and beta weights for reward-anticipation and reward-evaluation activation in the left and right NAcc, adjusted only for the random effects covariates (subject ID, nested within family ID, and scanner ID). We then subsequently updated the model to include additional fixed effect covariates to test the association after adjustment for potential confounders. These included sex, household income, parental education, ethnicity, motion in scanner, depressive symptoms and pubertal development.

We subsequently repeated the main analyses but included all individuals with psychiatric diagnosis and medication known to have significant impact on reward processing (stimulants and anti-psychotics, see supplementary tables 1-4). We also completed alternative analysis where PLEs were included as sum total, along with their associated distress (see supplementary tables 5-8).

All analyses were conducted in *R* (version 3.6.2) using the *robustlmm* package (Koller, 2016). The data was transformed into long format using *reshape2* (Wickham, 2007) to allow us to test for multivariate outcomes.

All analysis code and analysis output for this study has been made freely available on an Open Science Framework archive (https://osf.io/vqzhu/?view_only=d1aa10a296db42c3b355874f37a658d0).

Results

After applying our exclusion criteria, 6718 participants remained for either the reward anticipation (N = 6553) and/or reward outcome (N = 6654) analyses. The demographic characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1.

	Total (N = 6718)	*No PLEs (N = 4025)*	*Non-distressing PLEs (N = 833)*	*Distressing PLEs (N = 1860)*
Age (SD)	9.9 (0.62)	9.9 (0.62)	9.9 (0.62)	9.9 (0.62)
Gender N (%)				
Female	3494 (52.0%)	2107 (52.3%)	386 (46.3%)	1001 (53.8%)
Household income (USD)				
<50k	1872 (27.9%)	984 (24.4%)	236 (28.3%)	652 (35.1%)
>=50k & <100k	1866 (27.8%)	1090 (27.1%)	237 (28.4%)	539 (29.0%)
>=100k	2980 (44.4%)	1951 (48.5%)	360 (43.2%)	669 (36.0%)
Parental education N (%)				
< HS diploma	398 (5.9%)	181 (4.5%)	49 (5.9%)	168 (9.0%)
HS diploma/ GED	641 (9.5%)	347 (8.6%)	76 (9.1%)	218 (11.7%)
Some college	1847 (27.5%)	989 (24.6%)	262 (31.5%)	596 (32.0%)
Bachelor	2002 (29.8%)	1276 (31.7%)	230 (27.6%)	496 (26.7%)
Postgraduate degree	1830 (27.2%)	1232 (30.6%)	216 (25.9%)	382 (20.5%)
Ethnicity				
Asian	172 (2.6%)	114 (2.8%)	22 (2.6%)	36 (1.9%)
Black	886 (13.2%)	437 (10.9%)	124 (14.9%)	325 (17.5%)
Other/mixed	1193 (17.8%)	647 (16.1%)	166 (19.9%)	380 (20.4%)
White	4467 (66.5%)	2827 (70.2%)	521 (62.5%)	1119 (60.2%)

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants who contributed to either the reward anticipation or outcome analysis (N= 6718)

Effect of PLEs and distress on reward anticipation

As can be seen from Tables 2 and 3, there were main effects of reward magnitude and laterality on reward anticipation activity, indicating the validity of the paradigm, even after adjustment for potential confounders. However, there was no association with non-distressing or distressing PLEs in either analysis. Effects of PLE type on NAcc activation for reward anticipation are displayed by left and right laterality in Figure 1.

Predictor	*Estimate*	*95% CIs*	*p value*
Non-distressing PLEs	-0.001	-0.015, 0.013	0.879
Distressing PLEs	-0.006	-0.017, 0.004	0.244
Laterality (Right NAcc > Left NAcc)	-0.012	-0.017, -0.008	<0.001
Reward magnitude	-0.072	-0.077, -0.068	<0.001

Table 2. Unadjusted regression model (N = 6553) examining the effect of presence and type of PLEs, reward magnitude and laterality on nucleus accumbens (NAcc) response to reward anticipation

Predictor	*Estimate*	*95% CIs*	*p value*
Non-distressing PLEs	0.0005	-0.014, 0.015	0.949
Distressing PLEs	-0.002	-0.012, 0.009	0.755
Laterality (Right NAcc > Left NAcc)	-0.012	-0.017, -0.008	<0.001
Reward magnitude	-0.072	-0.077, -0.068	<0.001
Gender	0.001	-0.009, 0.010	0.912
Depressive symptoms	-0.005	-0.019, 0.009	0.461
Household income [<50K]	-0.001	-0.015, 0.013	0.856
Household income [>=50K & <100K]	-0.001	-0.013, 0.010	0.798
Parental education - < HS Diploma	-0.023	-0.046, -0.0001	0.049
Parental education - HS Diploma/GED	-0.025	-0.044, -0.007	0.007
Parental education - Post Graduate Degree	-0.007	-0.019, 0.005	0.231
Parental education - Some College	0.002	-0.015, 0.011	0.755
Race - Asian	-0.020	-0.049, 0.008	0.162
Race - Black	-0.003	-0.018, 0.012	0.698
Race - Other	-0.005	-0.017, 0.008	0.464
Motion	-0.036	-0.057, -0.016	<0.001
Pubertal development	-0.005	-0.015, 0.005	0.338

Table 3. Adjusted regression model (N = 6553) examining the effect of presence and type of PLEs, reward magnitude and laterality on nucleus accumbens (NAcc) response to reward anticipation



Figure 1. Relationship between PLE group status on left and right nucleus accumbens activation in the reward-anticipation component of the monetary incentive delay task

2) Effect of PLEs and distress on reward outcome

As show in Tables 4 and 5, there were main effects of NAcc laterality on reward anticipation activity, even after adjustment for potential confounders, but no association with non-distressing or distressing PLEs in either analysis. Effects of PLE type on NAcc activation for reward outcome are displayed by left and right laterality in Figure 2.

Predictor	*Estimate*	*95% CIs*	*p value*
Non distressing PLEs	-0.004	-0.021, 0.013	0.670
Distressing PLEs	-0.006	-0.019, 0.006	0.320
Laterality (Right NAcc > Left NAcc)	-0.025	-0.030, -0.021	<0.001

Table 4. Unadjusted regression model (N = 6654) on association between types of PLEs, distress, laterality on nucleus accumbens (NAcc) response to reward outcome.

Predictor	*Estimate*	*95% CIs*	*p value*
Non-distressing PLEs	-0.005	-0.022, 0.012	0.553
Distressing PLEs	-0.008	-0.021, 0.005	0.213
Laterality (Right NAcc > Left NAcc)	-0.025	-0.030, -0.021	<0.001
Gender	0.008	-0.003, 0.019	0.132
Depressive symptoms	0.009	-0.007, 0.026	0.265
Household income [<50K]	0.002	-0.015, 0.019	0.812
Household income [>=50K & <100K]	-0.00002	-0.013, 0.014	0.981
Parental education - < HS Diploma	-0.009	-0.037, 0.018	0.512
Parental education - HS Diploma/GED	-0.006	-0.029, 0.016	0.569
Parental education - Post Graduate Degree	-0.006	-0.021, 0.008	0.415
Parental education - Some College	-0.002	-0.017, 0.014	0.831
Race - Asian	0.022	-0.013, 0.058	0.212
Race - Black	-0.025	-0.044, -0.007	0.007
Race - Other	-0.012	-0.027, 0.003	0.127
Motion	0.075	0.052, 0.098	<0.001
Pubertal development	0.002	-0.011, 0.014	0.806

Table 5. Adjusted regression model (N = 6654) on association between types of PLEs, distress, laterality on nucleus accumbens (NAcc) response to reward outcome.



Figure 2. Relationship between PLE group status on left and right nucleus accumbens activation in the reward-outcome component of the MID task

In addition, we completed sensitivity analyses reported in supplementary tables 1 to 4 that included all individuals, including those with psychiatric diagnosis and medication use. The pattern of results was similar across analyses with regard to PLEs. The only exception was that PLE-related distress was significantly associated with striatal activation in the minimally adjusted reward anticipation analysis (-0.013 [-0.022, -0.004], p = 0.005). However, this relationship became non-significant in the fully adjusted analysis (-0.013 [0.018, <0.001], p = 0.053).

We also completed additional analysis examining the effect of PLEs and PLE-related distress by coding them as sum total variables: total number of PLEs and total levels of PLE-related distress. Total number of PLEs was not related to anticipation-related reward activation (<0.001 [-0.006, 0.007], p = 0.892) or reward outcome-related reward activation (0.001 [-0.007, 0.009], p = 0.855) in minimally adjusted analyses. Similarly, total level of PLE-related distress was not related to anticipation-related reward activation (-0.002 [-0.005, <0.001], p = 0.072) or reward outcome-related reward activation (-0.001 [-0.004, 0.002], p = 0.460) in minimally adjusted analyses. This pattern of relationships remained unchanged in the fully adjusted analyses (full details are given in supplementary tables 5-8).

Discussion

In this large study of over 6,500 9-10-year-old children, we report no association between PLEs and NAcc activation during either the reward anticipation or reward outcome stages of an fMRI MID task.

The findings have several implications for developmental models of psychosis risk and our understanding of explanatory mechanisms for psychosis-spectrum experiences more broadly. In terms of the psychosis risk, the developmental risk factor model (Murray et al., 2017) suggests that accumulated childhood and social adversity combined with genetic risk makes the striatal dopamine system hyper-responsive to stress. According to the model, these alterations generate the symptoms of psychosis through a process of aberrant assignment of salience to stimuli that would normally appear to have low levels of motivational significance (Howes and Kapur, 2009; Kapur, 2003). These findings have been supported by fMRI studies reporting dysregulated reward processing in the MID task in adults with psychosis (Juckel et al., 2006; Kirschner et al., 2018) and in adolescents with PLEs (Papanastasiou et al., 2018).

This study found no evidence for the presence of this mechanism at a peak age for PLEs in 9-10-year-old children. This is despite the fact that PLEs in children of this age predict poor outcome over the lifespan (Calkins et al., 2017; Downs et al., 2013), poorer cognitive abilities (Reichenberg et al., 2010) and greater levels of adversity (Trotta et al., 2015). This suggests that PLEs at this age are markers of adverse development and / or psychopathology but are potentially not associated with alterations to striatal activation, raising doubts over whether they share a mechanism proposed for psychotic-spectrum experiences later in life.

Notably, pre-adolescents have been shown to have several perceptual and reasoning differences that alter and stabilise during adolescence, potentially suggesting other mechanisms that might generate PLEs as measured by current scales. For example, there is evidence that pre-adolescent children may perform auditory functions more unreliably than adults, tending to rely more heavily on top-down interpretation of sounds (Moore, 2012). Similarly, in the visual domain, pre-adolescent children tend to rely more on high spatial frequencies to extract local facial features to perceive fearful facial expressions whereas adolescent children use rapid decoding of global features using in the low spatial frequency ranges (Peters and Kemner, 2017). Additionally and relevant to the measurement of unusual beliefs, magical thinking is common in childhood although declines into adolescence and this is largely understood in terms of the under-development of causal reasoning (Muentener and Bonawitz, 2018). Development in each of these domains may additionally be affected by developmental adversities, potentially giving rise to PLEs during preadolescence that are generated by distinct mechanisms fom PLEs reported later in life.

Based on current findings, we suggest that PLEs during preadolescence may be largely generated by processes of ‘under-developed’ perception and causal reasoning typical for this age group but that the presence of childhood adversity can impact the typical developmental trajectory, meaning that greater numbers of PLEs largely reflect developmental delay rather than dysregulation of striatal dopamine at this age. Nevertheless, as the risk factors for

developmental delay are also shared risk factors for psychosis, they may also contribute to hyper-responsiveness of the striatal dopamine system that can manifest as psychosis-spectrum experiences later in life. A small minority of individuals with a large number of risk factors may not show the expected decline in PLEs, as both developmental delay and early impact on the striatal dopamine system combine to maintain these experiences, at least as measured by current scales. This interactive developmental model would account for the contrasting trajectories of PLEs from childhood to adolescence where the majority of children show resolving or attenuated PLEs and only a small high-risk minority show persistent or intermittent PLEs (Thapar et al., 2012).

However, this study presents several limitations that warrant caution when interpreting its results. One limitation is the extent to which blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) signal in the ventral striatum allows accurate localisation of dysregulated subcortical dopamine. Meta-analytic evidence from PET studies suggests that it may be the dorsal rather than ventral striatum where dopamine dysregulation may be most apparent in adult psychosis (McCutcheon et al., 2018). The area of interest used in this study was the NAcc, based in the ventral striatum. Nevertheless, activation in this area during the MID task is reliably associated with psychosis across meta-analysis of multiple studies (Radua et al., 2015). Therefore, it is likely that BOLD signal response reliably reflects altered dopamine-mediated reward processing, but it may not accurately localise it. Indeed, a prior multimodal PET-fMRI study of the MID task (Dubol et al., 2018) reported that reward anticipation was reliably associated with BOLD signal in the NAcc with PET imaging showed it was associated with dopamine transporter availability in the midbrain. Consequently, we presume it is unlikely that there would be marked dysregulation to functionally adjacent areas in the dopamine system that would not result in BOLD detectable NAcc activation during the MID task, meaning it remains a useful measure of altered dopamine-mediated reward processing.

Although the ABCD endeavoured to obtain a nationally representative sample, children from higher income families were over-represented. We attempted to address this by including family and site as random effects as suggested by Heeringa and Berglund (2020), although it is possible that this did not fully eliminate sampling biases. PLEs were measured with the Prodromal Questionnaire – Brief Child Version. This is a self-report questionnaire and although has been well validated in this sample (Karcher et al., 2018) may not have had the same sensitivity as structured interview assessments.

In conclusion, we found no evidence of dysregulated reward processing predicted the presence of PLEs in a large and well-powered sample. As the ABCD study is ongoing cohort study, future research should focus on exploring the timing of PLE-related differences in reward processing arise during development.

Acknowledgements

Data used in the preparation of this article were obtained from the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development^{SM} (ABCD) Study (https://abcdstudy.org), held in the NIMH Data Archive (NDA). This is a multisite, longitudinal study designed to recruit more than 10,000 children age 9-10 and follow them over 10 years into early adulthood. The ABCD Study® is supported by the National Institutes of Health and additional federal partners under award numbers U01DA041022, U01DA041028, U01DA041048, U01DA041089, U01DA041106, U01DA041117, U01DA041120, U01DA041134, U01DA041148, U01DA041156, U01DA041174, U24DA041123, U24DA041147, U01DA041093, and U01DA041025. A full list of supporters is available at https://abcdstudy.org/federal-partners.html. A listing of participating sites and a complete listing of the study investigators can be found at https://abcdstudy.org/Consortium_Members.pdf. ABCD consortium investigators designed and implemented the study and/or provided data but did not necessarily participate in analysis or writing of this report. This manuscript reflects the views of the authors and may not reflect the opinions or views of the NIH or ABCD consortium investigators.

The ABCD data repository grows and changes over time. The ABCD data used in this report came from doi: 10.15154/1521353. DOIs can be found at https://doi.org

Funding

JHS: MRC doctoral studentship. HI: EU Horizon 2020 under a Marie Sklodowska-Curie grant (747429); National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. EB: NIHR UK (NIHR200756); Mental Health Research UK; ESRC; BMA Margaret Temple Fellowship; MRC New Investigator and Centenary Awards (G0901310 and G1100583). NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at UCL Hospitals and UCL. SJB: Wellcome (grant number WT107496/Z/15/Z); Jacobs Foundation; Wellspring Foundation; University of Cambridge. LM: MRC Clinician Scientist Fellowship (MR/S006613/1).

References

Calkins, M.E., Moore, T.M., Satterthwaite, T.D., Wolf, D.H., Turetsky, B.I., Roalf, D.R., Merikangas, K.R., Ruparel, K., Kohler, C.G., Gur, R.C., Gur, R.E., 2017. Persistence of psychosis spectrum symptoms in the Philadelphia Neurodevelopmental Cohort: a prospective two-year follow-up. World Psychiatry 16, 62–76. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20386

Cao, Z., Bennett, M., Orr, C., Icke, I., Banaschewski, T., Barker, G.J., Bokde, A.L.W., Bromberg, U., Büchel, C., Quinlan, E.B., Desrivières, S., Flor, H., Frouin, V., Garavan, H., Gowland, P., Heinz, A., Ittermann, B., Martinot, J.-L., Nees, F., Orfanos, D.P., Paus, T., Poustka, L., Hohmann, S., Fröhner, J.H., Smolka, M.N., Walter, H., Schumann, G., Whelan, R., 2019. Mapping adolescent reward anticipation, receipt, and prediction error during the monetary incentive delay task. Human Brain Mapping 40, 262–283. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24370

Casey, B.J., Cannonier, T., Conley, M.I., Cohen, A.O., Barch, D.M., Heitzeg, M.M., Soules, M.E., Teslovich, T., Dellarco, D.V., Garavan, H., Orr, C.A., Wager, T.D., Banich, M.T., Speer, N.K., Sutherland, M.T., Riedel, M.C., Dick, A.S., Bjork, J.M., Thomas, K.M., Chaarani, B., Mejia, M.H., Hagler, D.J., Daniela Cornejo, M., Sicat, C.S., Harms, M.P., Dosenbach, N.U.F., Rosenberg, M., Earl, E., Bartsch, H., Watts, R., Polimeni, J.R., Kuperman, J.M., Fair, D.A., Dale, A.M., 2018a. The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Consortium: Rationale, Aims, and Assessment Strategy 32, 43–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.03.001

Casey, B.J., Cannonier, T., Conley, M.I., Cohen, A.O., Barch, D.M., Heitzeg, M.M., Soules, M.E., Teslovich, T., Dellarco, D. V., Garavan, H., Orr, C.A., Wager, T.D., Banich, M.T., Speer, N.K., Sutherland, M.T., Riedel, M.C., Dick, A.S., Bjork, J.M., Thomas, K.M., Chaarani, B., Mejia, M.H., Hagler, D.J., Daniela Cornejo, M., Sicat, C.S., Harms, M.P., Dosenbach, N.U.F., Rosenberg, M., Earl, E., Bartsch, H., Watts, R., Polimeni, J.R., Kuperman, J.M., Fair, D.A., Dale, A.M., 2018b. The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.03.001

Clark, D.B., Fisher, C.B., Bookheimer, S., Brown, S.A., Evans, J.H., Hopfer, C., Hudziak, J., Montoya, I., Murray, M., Pfefferbaum, A., Yurgelun-Todd, D., 2018. Biomedical ethics and clinical oversight in multisite observational neuroimaging studies with children and adolescents: The ABCD experience. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2017.06.005

Davies, J., Sullivan, S., Zammit, S., 2018. Adverse life outcomes associated with adolescent psychotic experiences and depressive symptoms. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol 53, 497–507. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-018-1496-z

Dougherty, L.R., Schwartz, K.T.G., Kryza-Lacombe, M., Weisberg, J., Spechler, P.A., Wiggins, J.L., 2018. Preschool- and School-Age Irritability Predict Reward-Related Brain Function. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry 57, 407-417.e2. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2018.03.012

Downs, J.M., Cullen, A.E., Barragan, M., Laurens, K.R., 2013. Persisting psychotic-like experiences are associated with both externalising and internalising psychopathology in a longitudinal general population child cohort. Schizophrenia Research 144, 99–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2012.12.009

Dubol, M., Trichard, C., Leroy, C., Sandu, A.-L., Rahim, M., Granger, B., Tzavara, E.T., Karila, L., Martinot, J.-L., Artiges, E., 2018. Dopamine Transporter and Reward Anticipation in a Dimensional Perspective: A Multimodal Brain Imaging Study. Neuropsychopharmacology 43, 820–827. https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2017.183

Fischl, B., 2012. FreeSurfer. NeuroImage, 20 YEARS OF fMRI 62, 774–781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.01.021

Fisher, H.L., Caspi, A., Poulton, R., Meier, M.H., Houts, R., Harrington, H., Arseneault, L., Moffitt, T.E., 2013. Specificity of childhood psychotic symptoms for predicting schizophrenia by 38 years of age: A birth cohort study. Psychological Medicine 43, 2077–2086. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291712003091

Garavan, H., Bartsch, H., Conway, K., Decastro, A., Goldstein, R.Z., Heeringa, S., Jernigan, T., Potter, A., Thompson, W., Zahs, D., 2018. Recruiting the ABCD sample: Design considerations and procedures. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.04.004

Hagler, D.J., Hatton, S.N., Cornejo, M.D., Makowski, C., Fair, D.A., Dick, A.S., Sutherland, M.T., Casey, B.J., Barch, D.M., Harms, M.P., Watts, R., Bjork, J.M., Garavan, H.P., Hilmer, L., Pung, C.J., Sicat, C.S., Kuperman, J., Bartsch, H., Xue, F., Heitzeg, M.M., Laird, A.R., Trinh, T.T., Gonzalez, R., Tapert, S.F., Riedel, M.C., Squeglia, L.M., Hyde, L.W., Rosenberg, M.D., Earl, E.A., Howlett, K.D., Baker, F.C., Soules, M., Diaz, J., de Leon, O.R., Thompson, W.K., Neale, M.C., Herting, M., Sowell, E.R., Alvarez, R.P., Hawes, S.W., Sanchez, M., Bodurka, J., Breslin, F.J., Morris, A.S., Paulus, M.P., Simmons, W.K., Polimeni, J.R., van der Kouwe, A., Nencka, A.S., Gray, K.M., Pierpaoli, C., Matochik, J.A., Noronha, A., Aklin, W.M., Conway, K., Glantz, M., Hoffman, E., Little, R., Lopez, M., Pariyadath, V., Weiss, S.R., Wolff-Hughes, D.L., DelCarmen-Wiggins, R., Feldstein Ewing, S.W., Miranda-Dominguez, O., Nagel, B.J., Perrone, A.J., Sturgeon, D.T., Goldstone, A., Pfefferbaum, A., Pohl, K.M., Prouty, D., Uban, K., Bookheimer, S.Y., Dapretto, M., Galvan, A., Bagot, K., Giedd, J., Infante, M.A., Jacobus, J., Patrick, K., Shilling, P.D., Desikan, R., Li, Y., Sugrue, L., Banich, M.T., Friedman, N., Hewitt, J.K., Hopfer, C., Sakai, J., Tanabe, J., Cottler, L.B., Nixon, S.J., Chang, L., Cloak, C., Ernst, T., Reeves, G., Kennedy, D.N., Heeringa, S., Peltier, S., Schulenberg, J., Sripada, C., Zucker, R.A., Iacono, W.G., Luciana, M., Calabro, F.J., Clark, D.B., Lewis, D.A., Luna, B., Schirda, C., Brima, T., Foxe, J.J., Freedman, E.G., Mruzek, D.W., Mason, M.J., Huber, R., McGlade, E., Prescot, A., Renshaw, P.F., Yurgelun-Todd, D.A., Allgaier, N.A., Dumas, J.A., Ivanova, M., Potter, A., Florsheim, P., Larson, C., Lisdahl, K., Charness, M.E., Fuemmeler, B., Hettema, J.M., Maes, H.H., Steinberg, J., Anokhin, A.P., Glaser, P., Heath, A.C., Madden, P.A., Baskin-Sommers, A., Constable, R.T., Grant, S.J., Dowling, G.J., Brown, S.A., Jernigan, T.L., Dale, A.M., 2019. Image processing and analysis methods for the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study. NeuroImage. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116091

Healy, C., Brannigan, R., Dooley, N., Coughlan, H., Clarke, M., Kelleher, I., Cannon, M., 2019a. Childhood and adolescent psychotic experiences and risk of mental disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychological Medicine. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719000485

Healy, C., Brannigan, R., Dooley, N., Coughlan, H., Clarke, M., Kelleher, I., Cannon, M., 2019b. Childhood and adolescent psychotic experiences and risk of mental disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychological Medicine 49, 1589–1599. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719000485

Heeringa, S., Berglund, P., 2020. A Guide for Population-based Analysis of the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Study Baseline Data. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.10.942011

Herting, M.M., Gautam, P., Chen, Z., Mezher, A., Vetter, N.C., 2018. Test-retest reliability of longitudinal task-based fMRI: Implications for developmental studies. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, Methodological Challenges in Developmental Neuroimaging: Contemporary Approaches and Solutions 33, 17–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2017.07.001

Howes, O.D., Hird, E.J., Adams, R.A., Corlett, P.R., McGuire, P., 2020. Aberrant Salience, Information Processing, and Dopaminergic Signaling in People at Clinical High Risk for Psychosis. Biological Psychiatry, Psychosis Risk Syndrome 88, 304–314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2020.03.012

Howes, O.D., Kapur, S., 2009. The Dopamine Hypothesis of Schizophrenia: Version III—The Final Common Pathway. Schizophr Bull 35, 549–562. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbp006

Jongsma, H.E., Gayer-Anderson, C., Tarricone, I., Velthorst, E., Ven, E. van der, Quattrone, D., Forti, M. di, Group, E.-G.W., Menezes, P.R., Del-Ben, C.M., Arango, C., Lasalvia, A., Berardi, D., Cascia, C.L., Bobes, J., Bernardo, M., Sanjuán, J., Santos, J.L., Arrojo, M., Haan, L. de, Tortelli, A., Szöke, A., Murray, R.M., Rutten, B.P., Os, J. van, Morgan, C., Jones, P.B., Kirkbride, J.B., 2020. Social disadvantage, linguistic distance, ethnic minority status and first-episode psychosis: results from the EU-GEI case–control study. Psychological Medicine 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329172000029X

Juckel, G., Schlagenhauf, F., Koslowski, M., Wüstenberg, T., Villringer, A., Knutson, B., Wrase, J., Heinz, A., 2006. Dysfunction of ventral striatal reward prediction in schizophrenia. NeuroImage 29, 409–416. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2005.07.051

Kapur, S., 2003. Psychosis as a State of Aberrant Salience: A Framework Linking Biology, Phenomenology, and Pharmacology in Schizophrenia. AJP 160, 13–23. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.160.1.13

Karcher, N.R., Barch, D.M., Avenevoli, S., Savill, M., Huber, R.S., Simon, T.J., Leckliter, I.N., Sher, K.J., Loewy, R.L., 2018. Assessment of the prodromal questionnaire-brief child version for measurement of self-reported psychoticlike experiences in childhood. JAMA Psychiatry. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.1334

Kelleher, I., Connor, D., Clarke, M.C., Devlin, N., Harley, M., Cannon, M., 2012a. Prevalence of psychotic symptoms in childhood and adolescence: a systematic review and meta-analysis of population-based studies. Psychological Medicine 42, 1857–1863. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711002960

Kelleher, I., Keeley, H., Corcoran, P., Lynch, F., Fitzpatrick, C., Devlin, N., Molloy, C., Roddy, S., Clarke, M.C., Harley, M., Arseneault, L., Wasserman, C., Carli, V., Sarchiapone, M., Hoven, C., Wasserman, D., Cannon, M., 2012b. Clinicopathological significance of psychotic experiences in non-psychotic young people: evidence from four population-based studies. The British Journal of Psychiatry 201, 26–32. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.111.101543

Kirschner, M., Hager, O.M., Muff, L., Bischof, M., Hartmann-Riemer, M.N., Kluge, A., Habermeyer, B., Seifritz, E., Tobler, P.N., Kaiser, S., 2018. Ventral Striatal Dysfunction and Symptom Expression in Individuals With Schizotypal Personality Traits and Early Psychosis. Schizophr Bull 44, 147–157. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbw142

Knutson, B., Westdorp, A., Kaiser, E., Hommer, D., 2000. FMRI visualization of brain activity during a monetary incentive delay task. NeuroImage 12, 20–27. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2000.0593

Koller, M., 2016. robustlmm: An R Package for Robust Estimation of Linear Mixed-Effects Models. Journal of Statistical Software 75, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v075.i06

Ladouceur, C.D., Kerestes, R., Schlund, M.W., Shirtcliff, E.A., Lee, Y., Dahl, R.E., 2019. Neural systems underlying reward cue processing in early adolescence: The role of puberty and pubertal hormones. Psychoneuroendocrinology 102, 281–291. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2018.12.016

Linscott, R.J., Van Os, J., 2013. An updated and conservative systematic review and meta-analysis of epidemiological evidence on psychotic experiences in children and adults: On the pathway from proneness to persistence to dimensional expression across mental disorders. Psychological Medicine. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291712001626

Loewy, R.L., Pearson, R., Vinogradov, S., Bearden, C.E., Cannon, T.D., 2011. Psychosis risk screening with the Prodromal Questionnaire - Brief Version (PQ-B). Schizophrenia Research. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2011.03.029

MacManus, D., Laurens, K.R., Walker, E.F., Brasfield, J.L., Riaz, M., Hodgins, S., 2012. Movement abnormalities and psychotic-like experiences in childhood: markers of developing schizophrenia? Psychological Medicine 42, 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711001085

McCutcheon, R., Beck, K., Jauhar, S., Howes, O.D., 2018. Defining the Locus of Dopaminergic Dysfunction in Schizophrenia: A Meta-analysis and Test of the Mesolimbic Hypothesis. Schizophrenia Bulletin 44, 1301–1311. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbx180

Moore, D.R., 2012. Listening difficulties in children: Bottom-up and top-down contributions. Journal of Communication Disorders, 21st Annual NIDCD-Sponsored ASHA Research Symposium (2011):Neuroplasticity in the Mature Brain 45, 411–418. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2012.06.006

Morgan, C., Fisher, H., Hutchinson, G., Kirkbride, J., Craig, T.K., Morgan, K., Dazzan, P., Boydell, J., Doody, G.A., Jones, P.B., Murray, R.M., Leff, J., Fearon, P., 2009. Ethnicity, social disadvantage and psychotic-like experiences in a healthy population based sample. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 119, 226–235. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2008.01301.x

Muentener, P., Bonawitz, E., 2018. The development of causal reasoning. OSF Preprints. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/r8h9p

Murphy, D., Vallières, F., Murphy, J., McElroy, E., Hyland, P., 2020. Risk factors associated with general and specific dimensions of psychosis in a nationally representative sample of adults from the United States. Psychosis 0, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/17522439.2020.1791238

Murray, R.M., Bhavsar, V., Tripoli, G., Howes, O., 2017. 30 Years on: How the Neurodevelopmental Hypothesis of Schizophrenia Morphed into the Developmental Risk Factor Model of Psychosis. Schizophrenia Bulletin. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbx121

Nielsen, M.Ø., Rostrup, E., Wulff, S., Bak, N., Lublin, H., Kapur, S., Glenthøj, B., 2012. Alterations of the Brain Reward System in Antipsychotic Naïve Schizophrenia Patients. Biological Psychiatry, Altered Functional Connectivity in Schizophrenia 71, 898–905. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.02.007

Papanastasiou, E., Mouchlianitis, E., Joyce, D.W., McGuire, P., Banaschewski, T., Bokde, A.L.W., Bromberg, U., Büchel, C., Quinlan, E.B., Desrivières, S., Flor, H., Frouin, V., Garavan, H., Spechler, P., Gowland, P., Heinz, A., Ittermann, B., Martinot, J.-L., Paillère Martinot, M.-L., Artiges, E., Nees, F., Papadopoulos Orfanos, D., Poustka, L., Millenet, S., Fröhner, J.H., Smolka, M.N., Walter, H., Whelan, R., Schumann, G., Shergill, S., 2018. Examination of the Neural Basis of Psychoticlike Experiences in Adolescence During Reward Processing. JAMA Psychiatry 75, 1043–1051. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.1973

Peters, J.C., Kemner, C., 2017. Facial expressions perceived by the adolescent brain: Towards the proficient use of low spatial frequency information. Biological Psychology 129, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2017.07.022

Petersen, A.C., Crockett, L., Richards, M., Boxer, A., 1988. A self-report measure of pubertal status: Reliability, validity, and initial norms. J Youth Adolescence 17, 117–133. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01537962

Poulton, R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T.E., Cannon, M., Murray, R., Harrington, H., 2000. Children's self-reported psychotic symptoms and adult schizophreniform disorder: A 15-year longitudinal study. Archives of General Psychiatry 57, 1053–1058. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.57.11.1053

Radua, J., Schmidt, A., Borgwardt, S., Heinz, A., Schlagenhauf, F., McGuire, P., Fusar-Poli, P., 2015. Ventral Striatal Activation During Reward Processing in Psychosis: A Neurofunctional Meta-Analysis. JAMA Psychiatry 72, 1243–1251. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.2196

Reichenberg, A., Caspi, A., Harrington, H., Houts, R., Keefe, R.S.E., Murray, R.M., Poulton, R., Moffitt, T.E., 2010. Static and Dynamic Cognitive Deficits in Childhood Preceding Adult Schizophrenia: A 30-Year Study. AJP 167, 160–169. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2009.09040574

Rubio, J.M., Sanjuan, J., Florez-Salamanca, L., Cuesta, M.J., 2012. Examining the course of hallucinatory experiences in children and adolescents: A systematic review. SCHIZOPHRENIA RESEARCH 138, 248–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2012.03.012

Schultz, W., 2002. Getting Formal with Dopamine and Reward. Neuron 36, 241–263. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(02)00967-4

Sullivan, S.A., Kounali, D., Cannon, M., David, A.S., Fletcher, P.C., Holmans, P., Jones, H., Jones, P.B., Linden, D.E.J., Lewis, G., Owen, M.J., O'Donovan, M., Rammos, A., Thompson, A., Wolke, D., Heron, J., Zammit, S., 2020. A Population-Based Cohort Study Examining the Incidence and Impact of Psychotic Experiences From Childhood to Adulthood, and Prediction of Psychotic Disorder. AJP appi.ajp.2019.19060654. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.19060654

Takamura, M., Okamoto, Y., Okada, G., Toki, S., Yamamoto, T., Ichikawa, N., Mori, A., Minagawa, H., Takaishi, Y., Fujii, Y., Kaichi, Y., Akiyama, Y., Awai, K., Yamawaki, S., 2017. Patients with major depressive disorder exhibit reduced reward size coding in the striatum. Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry 79, 317–323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2017.07.006

Thapar, A., Heron, J., Jones, R.B., Owen, M.J., Lewis, G., Zammit, S., 2012. Trajectories of change in self-reported psychotic-like experiences in childhood and adolescence. Schizophrenia Research 140, 104–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2012.06.024

Trotta, A., Arseneault, L., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T.E., Danese, A., Pariante, C., Fisher, H.L., 2020. Mental Health and Functional Outcomes in Young Adulthood of Children With Psychotic Symptoms: A Longitudinal Cohort Study. Schizophr Bull 46, 261–271. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbz069

Trotta, A., Murray, R.M., Fisher, H.L., 2015. The impact of childhood adversity on the persistence of psychotic symptoms: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychological Medicine 45, 2481–2498. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291715000574

Turner, B.O., Paul, E.J., Miller, M.B., Barbey, A.K., 2018. Small sample sizes reduce the replicability of task-based fMRI studies. Communications Biology 1, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-018-0073-z

van Os, J., Linscott, R.J., Myin-Germeys, I., Delespaul, P., Krabbendam, L., 2009. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the psychosis continuum: evidence for a psychosis proneness–persistence–impairment model of psychotic disorder. Psychological Medicine 39, 179–195. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708003814

Volkow, N.D., Koob, G.F., Croyle, R.T., Bianchi, D.W., Gordon, J.A., Koroshetz, W.J., Pérez-Stable, E.J., Riley, W.T., Bloch, M.H., Conway, K., Deeds, B.G., Dowling, G.J., Grant, S., Howlett, K.D., Matochik, J.A., Morgan, G.D., Murray, M.M., Noronha, A., Spong, C.Y., Wargo, E.M., Warren, K.R., Weiss, S.R.B., 2018. The conception of the ABCD study: From substance use to a broad NIH collaboration. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, The Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development (ABCD) Consortium: Rationale, Aims, and Assessment Strategy 32, 4–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2017.10.002

Wickham, H., 2007. Reshaping data with the reshape package. Journal of Statistical Software. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v021.i12

Wotruba, D., Heekeren, K., Michels, L., Buechler, R., Simon, J.J., Theodoridou, A., Kollias, S., Rössler, W., Kaiser, S., 2014. Symptom dimensions are associated with reward processing in unmedicated persons at risk for psychosis. Front. Behav. Neurosci. 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00382