

Behavioral and neural dissociation of social anxiety and loneliness

Jana Lieberz^{a,*}, Simone G. Shamay-Tsoory^b, Nira Saporta^b, Alisa Kanterman^b,
Jessica Gorni^a, Timo Esser^a, Ekaterina Kuskova^a, Johannes Schultz^{c,d},
René Hurlemann^{e,f}, Dirk Scheele^{a,e,*}

^a Research Section Medical Psychology, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Hospital Bonn, 53127 Bonn, Germany

^b Department of Psychology, University of Haifa, Haifa 3498838, Israel

^c Center for Economics and Neuroscience, University of Bonn, 53127 Bonn, Germany

^d Institute of Experimental Epileptology and Cognition Research, University of Bonn, 53127 Bonn, Germany

^e Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine & Health Sciences, University of Oldenburg, 26129 Oldenburg, Germany

^f Research Center Neurosensory Science, University of Oldenburg, 26129 Oldenburg, Germany

Corresponding Author:

Jana Lieberz, jana.lieberz@hotmail.de

Dirk Scheele, dirk-scheele@gmx.de

Keywords: amygdala, fMRI, loneliness, striatum, social anxiety

1 **Abstract**

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

2

3 **Background:** Loneliness is a public health concern with detrimental effects on physical and
4 mental well-being. Given phenotypical overlaps between loneliness and social anxiety,
5 cognitive behavioral interventions targeting social anxiety might be adopted to reduce
6 loneliness. However, it is still elusive whether social anxiety and loneliness share the same
7 underlying neurocognitive mechanisms. The current study aimed at investigating to what
8 extent known behavioral and neural correlates of social avoidance in social anxiety are evident
9 in loneliness. **Methods:** We used a pre-stratified approach involving 42 participants with high
10 and 40 control participants with low loneliness scores. During functional magnetic resonance
11 imaging, the participants completed a social gambling task to measure the subjective value of
12 engaging in a social situation and responses to positive and negative social feedback. **Results:**
13 Uni- and multivariate analyses of behavioral and neural data replicated known task effects
14 across groups. However, although lonely participants were characterized by increased social
15 anxiety, loneliness was associated with a response pattern clearly distinct from social anxiety.
16 Specifically, Bayesian analyses revealed moderate evidence for equal subjective values of
17 engaging in social situations and comparable amygdala responses to social decision-making
18 and striatal responses to positive social feedback in both groups. Conversely, lonely
19 participants showed significantly altered behavioral responsiveness to negative feedback and
20 reduced striatal activity, whereas striatal-hippocampal connectivity was increased compared
21 to controls. **Conclusion:** Our findings suggest that loneliness is associated with altered
22 emotional reactivity to social situations rather than behavioral tendencies to withdraw from
23 social interactions. Thus, established interventions for social anxiety should be adjusted when
24 targeting loneliness.

25 Introduction

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

26 Loneliness is a painful condition which can be a catalyst for subjective stress (1) and is
27 associated with detrimental effects on mental and physical health (2, 3). As such, loneliness
28 has been identified as a risk factor for premature mortality comparable with smoking or obesity
29 (4, 5). Consequently, loneliness has come into focus of politics and clinicians as a major public
30 health concern with high economic costs for society (6-8). With social distancing in place in
31 most countries around the world, COVID-19 is expected to have vast impact on physical and
32 mental health, particularly in people inflicted by poor resilience to social adversity due to pre-
33 existing low levels of social integration (9, 10). Preliminary evidence indicate that the
34 prevalence of loneliness might have increased due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which
35 emphasizes the urgent need of interventions to target loneliness (11-14).

36 Recent findings highlight a close link of loneliness with social anxiety symptoms (15-17) and
37 identified social anxiety as predictor for future loneliness (18-20). For instance, social anxiety
38 was found to be consistently associated with social isolation, lower perceived social support,
39 and decreased relationship satisfaction (21-23). Moreover, poor friendship quality promotes
40 increases in social anxiety symptomatology (24). A perceived discrepancy in the quality and
41 quantity of the actual and desired relationships, in turn, is a key feature of loneliness (25).
42 Likewise, safety behavior such as the avoidance of social situations is known to be a core
43 mechanism fostering the maintenance of social anxiety and is also hypothesized to be
44 preferred by lonely individuals (26, 27).

45 Given the phenotypical overlap between loneliness and social anxiety, cognitive behavioral
46 therapies targeting social anxiety might be co-opted as interventions to reduce loneliness.
47 Existing programs are often based on cognitive models of social anxiety (28), which posit an
48 exaggerated fear of evaluation as a core etiological mechanism of psychopathology. Indeed,
49 current neurocircuitry models of social anxiety disorder emphasize amygdala hyperreactivity
50 to social stimuli (29, 30) and we have recently observed increased amygdala responses during

51 social decision-making and social feedback in healthy individuals with high social anxiety (31).

52 By contrast, the neural responsiveness to social rewards such as happy faces seems to be
53 reduced in individuals with social anxiety (31-34), potentially resulting in reduced positive affect
54 in response to social interactions and impaired memory for positive social events (35, 36).
55 Similarly, lonely individuals exhibit an attenuated responsiveness to positive social interactions
56 (37) and there is preliminary evidence indicating that alterations in amygdala structure and
57 function are associated with loneliness (for a current comprehensive review of neurobiological
58 factors associated with loneliness, see (38)). However, it is still elusive whether social anxiety
59 and loneliness share similar neurobiological substrates during social interactions or whether
60 psychotherapeutic protocols need to be adjusted to reduce chronic loneliness.

61 The current study therefore aims at examining whether previously reported mechanisms
62 underlying social anxiety (cf. (31)) could be replicated in loneliness. Thus, we recruited a pre-
63 stratified sample of 42 healthy participants scoring high (high-lonely, HL) and 40 control
64 participants scoring low (low-lonely, LL) on a loneliness scale. During functional magnetic
65 resonance imaging (fMRI), the participants completed a social gambling task to measure the
66 subjective value of engaging in a social situation and responses to positive and negative social
67 feedback. The task has been previously used to identify a potential neural circuitry underlying
68 the social avoidance behavior associated with social anxiety (cf. (31)). Given the intertwined
69 phenotype of both constructs, we hypothesized that lonely individuals would exhibit a
70 decreased subjective value of engaging in social situations as observed for social anxiety.
71 Likewise, we expected increased amygdala activation during social decision-making and social
72 feedback and concomitantly decreased reward-associated responses of the nucleus
73 accumbens (NAcc) to positive social feedback in lonely participants. We further tested whether
74 changes in brain activity were associated with altered functional connectivity. In an additional
75 exploratory analysis, we examined distinct behavioral and neural response patterns in
76 loneliness that have not been previously found to be associated with social anxiety (i.e.,
77 responsiveness to negative social feedback). Notably, we controlled for the influence of social

78 anxiety and further potential confounding variables including depressive symptomatology and
79 childhood maltreatment for all observed associations of loneliness with neural or behavioral
80 measurements.

81 **Materials and Methods** made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

82

83 **Participants**

84 We recruited a sample of 82 (out of a stratified sample of 3678 adults; 41 females, mean age
85 \pm standard deviation (SD): 26.83 ± 7.47 years) pre-stratified healthy volunteers with high ($n =$
86 42) and low loneliness scores ($n = 40$) as assessed by the revised version of the UCLA
87 loneliness scale (UCLA-L, (39); for details, see supplementary material and (37)). All
88 participants gave written informed consent. The study was approved by the institutional review
89 board of the Medical Faculty of the University of Bonn (study number 016/18) and conducted
90 in accordance with the latest revision of the Declaration of Helsinki.

91

92 **Behavioral tasks**

93 We measured the participants' subjective value of engaging in social situations with a social
94 gambling task (cf. (31) and see supplementary material). During a decision phase, participants
95 could choose a risky (a dice game with a virtual human or computer partner with equiprobable
96 outcomes of 3 or 0 €) or a safe option (a fixed payoff ranging from 0 to 3 €). If participants
97 chose the risky option, either a positive or a negative feedback video of the partner (human or
98 computer) was shown (feedback phase), depending on the outcome of the trial (win or loss).
99 As such, the human feedback video displayed the virtual human partner expressing either
100 admiration or condescension. All human videos were taken from a validated database (40). In
101 the computer control condition, the feedback was given by a video of a green checkmark
102 (participant won) or a red cross (participant lost). If participants chose the safe option, a
103 sentence confirmed the payoff. Individual certainty equivalents of the risky option (termed
104 CE50), i.e., the certain payoff for which a participant would be indifferent between the risky and
105 safe options (i.e., they would choose each option with equal probability), were estimated

106 separately for the computer and the human partners by fitting participants' choices with a
107 cumulative Gaussian function. CE20 and CE80, i.e., certain payoffs associated with choosing
108 the safe option with 20 % and 80 % probability, were similarly estimated. The subjective value
109 of engaging in social situations was defined as the individual difference between the estimated
110 CE50 for human partners compared to the computer partner. After finishing the task, the
111 pleasantness of each feedback video was rated on a visual analogue scale ranging from 0
112 ("not pleasant at all") to 100 ("very pleasant"). The task was then repeated during functional
113 magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) with randomly chosen partners (human or computer) for
114 each trial. The fixed payoff offered as safe option varied randomly between the individually
115 determined values CE20, CE50, and CE80. Using individualized payoffs as a safe alternative
116 enabled us to equate the number of risky and safe choices across participants.

117 We further measured the individual monetary value associated with receiving positive or
118 avoiding negative social feedback during a virtual auction task. Specifically, participants were
119 informed that they were participating in a virtual auction against the computer using a random
120 algorithm to invest money. Participants were then asked with no imposed time limit to invest
121 any amount of money between 0 € and 1 € (in increments of 5 cents) to (1) increase the
122 probability of watching a positive social feedback video or (2) to decrease the probability of
123 watching a negative social feedback video (see supplementary material).

124

125 **Statistical analyses**

126 Behavioral data were analyzed in SPSS 24 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY) by calculating analyses
127 of variance (ANOVAs) and Bonferroni-corrected (P_{cor}) post-hoc t-tests. P -values < 0.05 (two-
128 tailed) were considered significant. To analyze the fMRI data, we used a two-stage approach
129 as implemented in SPM12 (Wellcome Trust Center for Neuroimaging, London, UK;
130 <http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm>). On the first level, data were modeled using a fixed-effects

131 model. Within-subject contrasts of interest were entered to a random-effects model on the
132 second level to assess group-specific response patterns by calculating two-sample t-tests.
133 Specifically, to probe the hypothesis of increased amygdala activation during social decision-
134 making in HL participants, we compared brain activity during risky decisions involving a human
135 partner between groups by calculating two-sample t-tests (i.e., HL risky decision human > safe decision human
136 > LL risky decision human > safe decision human, HL risky decision human > risky decision computer > LL risky decision human > risky
137 decision computer). Likewise, the hypothesized increased amygdala responsiveness to social
138 feedback (HL human feedback > computer feedback > LL human feedback > computer feedback) and reduced NAcc
139 reactivity to positive social feedback (LL positive human feedback > positive computer feedback > HL positive human
140 feedback > positive computer feedback) were tested by calculating two-sample t-tests. As the behavioral
141 data indicated an altered responsiveness to negative social feedback (see results), we
142 explored group differences in response to negative human feedback videos (HL negative human
143 feedback > negative computer feedback > LL negative human feedback > negative computer feedback). These contrasts were
144 also calculated in the opposite direction (e.g., LL risky decision human > risky decision computer > HL risky decision
145 human > risky decision computer). The amygdala and NAcc were anatomically defined according to the
146 Wake Forest University PickAtlas (41, 42). *P*-values < 0.05 after familywise error correction for
147 multiple testing (P_{FWE}) based on the size of the respective region of interest were considered
148 significant. Parameter estimates of clusters showing significant group effects were extracted
149 and further analyzed in SPSS 24 to disentangle the group x task condition interaction.
150 Behavioral group effects were correlated with parameter estimates of neural group effects. For
151 details, see supplementary material. The analysis plan was preregistered prior to conducting
152 any analyses (<https://osf.io/x47ke>). All data used in this study are openly available
153 (<https://osf.io/p6jxk/> and <https://neurovault.org/collections/VNYRMORR/>).

154

155 **Explorative analyses**

156 We conducted a multivariate pattern analysis using the Decoding Toolbox (43) to test whether
157 we could replicate previous findings that decisions of the participants could be decoded from
158 amygdala activation (cf. (31)). Contrasts revealing significant group effects in the univariate
159 activity analyses (see above) were further examined by generalized psychophysiological
160 interaction (gPPI) analyses using the CONN toolbox 19.b (www.nitrc.org/projects/conn,
161 RRID:SCR_009550). Mediation and moderation analyses were run to examine the potential
162 influence of depressive and social anxiety symptoms (assessed by the Beck's Depression
163 Inventory II, BDI (44) and the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale, LSAS (45)) and childhood
164 maltreatment (assessed by the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire, CTQ (46)) on observed
165 loneliness effects. For hypotheses that could not be confirmed, we conducted Bayesian t-tests
166 using JASP (47) to quantify the evidence for an absence of group differences. For details of
167 the explorative analyses, see supplementary material.

168


169 **Results**

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

170

171 **Behavioral results**

172 As expected, social anxiety was significantly increased in HL participants ($t(67.74) = 3.25$, $P =$
173 0.002 , $d = 0.72$; mean LSAS score \pm SD in HL: 18.64 ± 15.91 ; LL: 9.28 ± 9.56 ; see (37) and
174 **Fig. 1A**) and task effects of the social gambling task reported by (31) were replicated across
175 groups (see supplementary material and **Fig. 1B**). However, contrary to previously observed
176 effects of social anxiety (31), loneliness (HL vs. LL) affected neither the subjective value of
177 engaging in social situations during the behavioral social gambling task nor the invested money
178 in the virtual auction task (all P s > 0.05).



179

180 **Fig. 1. Behavioral results of the decision and feedback phase of the social gambling**
181 **task.** (A) Participants with a high loneliness score (HL) showed significantly increased social
182 anxiety scores as assessed with the Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale. (B) The proportion of safe
183 decisions during the social gambling task increased with higher payoffs offered in those safe
184 decisions (main effect of offered payoff for the behavioral task: $F(2.95, 236.14) = 183.77$, $P <$
185 0.001 , $\eta_p^2 = 0.70$; functional magnetic resonance imaging task: $F(2, 158) = 185.43$, $P < 0.001$,
186 $\eta_p^2 = 0.70$; example data of the behavioral task from one HL participant are presented). As
187 presented in the inset, HL participants did not significantly differ from control participants (LL)
188 with regard to the subjective value of engaging in a social situation (i.e., CE50, the payoff

189 offered in the safe option associated with 50% of safe decisions) (C). By contrast, groups
190 significantly differed in their pleasantness ratings of the negative feedback videos. Compared
191 to the negative computer feedback video, HL participants rated the negative human feedback
192 video as more pleasant, whereas LL control participants showed the opposite pattern of
193 ratings. No differences between groups were observed for positive feedback. Each marker in
194 (B) represents the mean of 8 trials. Bars represent group means. Error bars indicate standard
195 errors of the mean. Abbreviations: n.s., not significant. * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$.

196

197 Nevertheless, analyses of pleasantness ratings of the feedback videos revealed a significant
198 interaction of group x partner x feedback valence ($F(1,80) = 4.02$, $P = 0.048$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$). To
199 disentangle the interaction, we calculated further mixed ANOVAs separately for the positive
200 and negative feedback videos. Surprisingly, no group effects were observed for positive
201 feedback (all P s > 0.05), but we found a significant interaction of group x partner for negative
202 feedback ($F(1,80) = 4.34$, $P = 0.04$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.05$; see **Fig. 1C**). HL participants rated the negative
203 human feedback video as more pleasant compared to the negative computer feedback ($t(41)$
204 $= 2.09$, $P_{\text{cor}} = 0.09$), while LL participants showed the opposite pattern of ratings ($t(39) = -0.82$,
205 $P_{\text{cor}} = 0.84$).


206

207 **fMRI results**

208 Multi- and univariate analyses of neural activation across groups replicated all previous task
209 effects (31). As such, a linear support vector machine classifier based on amygdala activation
210 was able to decode the decision (risky vs. safe) significantly better than chance (mean
211 accuracy \pm SD = 53.64 \pm 9.07 %; 30, -4, ,28, $t(73) = 3.45$, $P_{\text{FWE}} = 0.048$). Amygdala activation
212 increased during decisions involving a human partner compared to the computer partner (right:
213 22, -6, -12, $t(73) = 3.68$, $P_{\text{FWE}} = 0.03$; left: -22, -8, -12, $t(73) = 4.00$, $P_{\text{FWE}} = 0.01$). Specifically,
214 amygdala activity was enhanced during trials in which participants chose the risky option with
215 a human partner compared to the computer partner (right: 22, -6, -12, $t(73) = 4.58$, $P_{\text{FWE}} =$

216 0.002; left: -22, -8, -12, $t(73) = 4.23$, $P_{FWE} = 0.006$; see **Fig. 2A**), while no differences in
217 amygdala activity between partners were observed for safe decisions. Moreover, receiving
218 feedback from the human partner activated the amygdala significantly stronger than computer
219 feedback (right: 22, -6, -14, $t(75) = 9.67$, $P_{FWE} < 0.001$, left: -22, -8, -12, $t(75) = 9.66$, $P_{FWE} <$
220 0.001) and NAcc activity across partners was increased in response to positive feedback
221 compared to negative feedback (right: 12, 8, -6, $t(75) = 6.45$, $P_{FWE} < 0.001$, left: -14, 10 -10,
222 $t(75) = 4.91$, $P_{FWE} < 0.001$). For whole-brain task effects, see **Table S1**.

223 Importantly, however, amygdala activation during the decision or feedback stage did not
224 significantly differ between HL and LL participants. Conversely, we observed significant
225 differences in striatal responses to the feedback videos. HL participants showed significantly
226 smaller NAcc responses to human (vs. computer) feedback videos than LL individuals (14, 14,
227 -10, $t(74) = 3.07$, $P_{FWE} = 0.02$). Again, the group difference was specific for negative feedback
228 videos (14, 14, -10, $t(74) = 3.21$, $P_{FWE} = 0.01$; see supplementary material and **Fig. 2B**),
229 whereas no significant group effects were observed for responses to positive feedback videos.
230 Post-hoc tests revealed increased NAcc responsiveness to negative human feedback
231 compared to the computer feedback in LL participants ($t(36) = 2.59$, $P_{cor} = 0.03$, $d = 0.53$),
232 while HL participants exhibited the opposite response pattern ($t(38) = -1.96$, $P_{cor} = 0.12$). No
233 further group differences in brain activity were observed.




234

235 **Fig. 2. Neural activation during the social gambling task. (A)** Amygdala activity was
 236 significantly enhanced during the decision phase of the social gambling task when participants
 237 chose the risky option with a human partner compared to the computer partner (right: 22, -6, -
 238 12, $t(73) = 4.58$, $P_{FWE} = 0.002$; left: -22, -8, -12, $t(73) = 4.23$, $P_{FWE} = 0.006$). In line with the
 239 behavioral results, no group differences in neural activity were observed during the decision
 240 phase. **(B)** During the feedback stage, participants with high loneliness scores (HL) showed
 241 attenuated nucleus accumbens (NAcc) responses to negative feedback given by human
 242 partners compared to the computer partner. In contrast, NAcc reactivity to negative human
 243 feedback was enhanced compared to computer feedback in control participants (LL). Shaded
 244 areas show the standard error of the mean of the fitted responses based on the hemodynamic
 245 response function. For illustration purpose, clusters are shown with significance levels of $P <$
 246 0.05 uncorrected. Abbreviations: L, left, R, right.

247

248 Exploratory gPPI analyses of the negative feedback condition with the NAcc serving as seed
249 region indicated enhanced functional connectivity of the left NAcc with a cluster including the
250 hippocampus in HL compared to LL participants (-14, -22, -14, $k = 73$, $t(74) = 5.38$, $P_{FWE} =$
251 0.049 on cluster level; see **Fig. 3A**). Again, post-hoc tests revealed an opposing pattern
252 between groups with enhanced connectivity while receiving negative human (vs. computer)
253 feedback in HL participants ($t(38) = 3.06$, $P_{cor} = 0.01$, $d = 0.63$) and reduced connectivity in LL
254 participants ($t(36) = -4.93$, $P_{cor} < 0.001$, $d = -1.15$). Interestingly, NAcc-hippocampus
255 connectivity not only correlated with NAcc responses to negative human feedback (contrasted
256 with negative computer feedback: $r(74) = -0.33$, $P = 0.004$, i.e., increased connectivity was
257 associated with reduced neural reactivity), but also with pleasantness ratings of negative
258 feedback videos ($r(74) = 0.23$, $P = 0.04$, see **Fig. 3B**). The correlation between NAcc activity
259 and negative feedback ratings was similar, but failed to reach significance ($r(74) = -0.20$, $P =$
260 0.09).



261

262 **Fig. 3. Functional connectivity during the social gambling task.** Participants with high
263 loneliness scores (HL) showed enhanced functional connectivity of the nucleus accumbens
264 (blue sphere) with a cluster including the hippocampus while receiving negative human (vs.
265 computer) feedback compared to control participants (LL). Functional connectivity positively
266 correlated with the pleasantness ratings of the negative human feedback (compared to the
267 negative computer feedback). The dashed line represents the 95%-confidence interval of the

268 *plotted regression line. Bars represent group means. Error bars indicate standard errors of the*
269 *mean. Abbreviations: L, left, R, right. * $P < 0.05$, *** $P < 0.001$.*

270

271 **Bayesian analyses and effects of confounding variables**

272 Bayesian analyses revealed moderate evidence for the absence of group differences in
273 variables that have previously been associated with social anxiety (cf. (31)), with our data being
274 at least three times more likely under the null hypothesis (H0: no differences between groups)
275 than under the alternative hypothesis (HL differ from LL participants in any direction).
276 Specifically, Bayesian t-tests revealed moderate evidence that HL participants indeed did not
277 differ from LL participants regarding the pleasantness ratings of positive human compared to
278 computer feedback as our data were found to be almost four times more likely under the H0
279 than under the alternative hypothesis (Bayes factor (BF_{10}) = 0.25, median effect size = 0.08,
280 95 % credible interval: [-0.32, 0.49]).

281 Likewise, Bayesian analyses revealed moderate evidence that groups showed equal reward-
282 associated brain activity in response to positive human feedback (contrasted with positive
283 computer feedback; left NAcc: BF_{10} = 0.25, median effect size = 0.07, 95 % credible interval:
284 [-0.35, 0.49]; for the right NAcc the evidence is inconclusive: BF_{10} = 0.43, median effect size =
285 0.23, 95 % credible interval: [-0.19, 0.66]) and moderate evidence in favor of the H0 for
286 amygdala reactivity to human feedback (contrasted with computer feedback; left: BF_{10} = 0.24,
287 median effect size = -0.004, 95 % credible interval: [-0.42, 0.41]; right: BF_{10} = 0.24, median
288 effect size \approx 0.00, 95 % credible interval: [-0.42, 0.42]). The same pattern of results was
289 observed for amygdala activation during the decision stage of the social gambling task as our
290 data were up to four times more likely under the assumption of comparable activation between
291 groups (H0) than under the alternative hypothesis (left amygdala activation for risky decisions
292 with a human partner compared to a computer partner: BF_{10} = 0.24, median effect size = 0.03,
293 95 % credible interval: [-0.39, 0.45]; left amygdala activation for risky decisions with a human

294 partner contrasted with safe decisions in trials with a human partner; $BF_{10} = 0.33$, median effect
295 size = -0.17, 95 % credible interval: [-0.61, 0.25]; right: $BF_{10} = 0.24$, median effect size = -0.01,
296 95 % credible interval: [-0.43, 0.41]). For right amygdala activation, there was insufficient
297 evidence to draw a conclusion for or against the hypothesis that groups exhibit equal
298 responsiveness to risky decisions involving a human partner (contrasted with the computer;
299 $BF_{10} = 0.50$, median effect size = 0.26, 95 % credible interval: [-0.16, 0.70]). However,
300 descriptive analyses revealed an opposing response pattern in HL participants to what has
301 been expected due to increased social anxiety symptoms: while LL participants showed slightly
302 enhanced amygdala activation (mean parameter estimates \pm SD: 0.25 ± 1.06), amygdala
303 activation was reduced in HL participants (mean parameter estimates \pm SD: -0.02 ± 0.68 ; cf.
304 **Fig. 2A**). Likewise, no evidence for any of the hypotheses (null or alternative hypothesis) was
305 observed for the subjective value of engaging in social situations ($BF_{10} = 0.57$, median effect
306 size = -0.29, 95 % credible interval = [-0.74, 0.15]). Again, descriptive analyses revealed
307 enhanced values of social engagement in HL compared to LL participants, which is contrary
308 to the previously reported negative association with social anxiety (see inlay of **Fig. 1B** and cf.
309 (31)).

310 Regarding the invested money during the virtual auction task, Bayesian analyses provided
311 moderate evidence for comparable investments between groups to avoid negative social
312 feedback ($BF_{10} = 0.33$, median effect size = 0.17, 95 % credible interval = [-0.23, 0.59]) or to
313 receive positive social feedback ($BF_{10} = 0.33$, median effect size = 0.18, 95 % credible interval
314 = [-0.23, 0.59]).

315 Mediation and moderation analyses indicated that none of the reported group effects was
316 mediated or moderated by confounding psychiatric symptoms (see supplementary material).
317 Moreover, the observed effects of loneliness (HL vs. LL) on NAcc responsiveness to negative
318 human feedback remained significant after including the potential mediators in the regression
319 models ($P_s < .01$ for all direct effects of group after including the mediator). Likewise, loneliness

320 effects on NAcc-hippocampal functional connectivity while receiving negative human feedback
321 was found to be robust (all direct effects of group after including the respective mediator P s <
322 .0001) and even increased after including social anxiety scores in the regression model (see
323 supplementary material).

324 **Discussion**

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

325

326 The current study sought to investigate shared and distinct behavioral and neural response
327 patterns underlying social anxiety and loneliness. Our results revealed that a previously
328 observed neurocircuitry underlying avoidance behavior in social anxiety (cf. (31)) could not be
329 replicated in lonely individuals. HL participants differed from control participants neither in the
330 subjective value of engaging in social situations nor in neural responses to social decision-
331 making and positive social feedback. Conversely, HL participants showed altered
332 responsiveness to negative social feedback evident in opposing behavioral response patterns
333 and striatal brain activity and connectivity compared to control participants.

334 Our results thus indicate that loneliness might be more associated with altered emotional
335 reactivity to social situations than with behavioral tendencies to withdraw from social
336 interactions. Human and animal research have consistently shown that the amygdala is
337 crucially involved in the processing of threat-related stimuli and hyperactivation of the
338 amygdala is known as a core mechanism underlying anxiety disorders (30, 48). Moreover,
339 amygdala habituation to threat-related stimuli and amygdala connectivity with prefrontal
340 regions predict subsequent avoidance behavior (49-51). Likewise, we have previously found
341 that amygdala activation during decisions in the social gambling task increases with social
342 anxiety symptomatology and negatively correlates with the subjective value to engage in social
343 situations (31). By contrast, the subjective value of engaging in a social situation did not differ
344 between HL participants and controls and Bayesian analyses revealed evidence for
345 comparable amygdala activation during the decision and feedback stages. In line with our
346 findings, neuroanatomical correlates of social avoidance behavior were previously found to be
347 unaffected by loneliness (52). This notion is consistent with etiological theories that highlight
348 maladaptive social cognitions in the development and maintenance of loneliness (27, 53).
349 Likewise, cognitive-behavioral interventions were found to be more effective in targeting social

350 biases than social skill trainings (54, 55). There is preliminary evidence that established
351 cognitive-behavioral treatments targeting social anxiety concurrently decrease feelings of
352 loneliness and vice versa (56-60), but our findings of distinct behavioral and neural substrates
353 suggest that loneliness-adjusted protocols might improve therapeutic outcomes.

354 Moreover, our results provide new insights into the neural pathways underlying loneliness.
355 Unexpectedly, striatal activity during negative social feedback was reduced while pleasantness
356 ratings were increased in HL participants. Notably, activation of the NAcc is associated with
357 goal-directed approach and avoidance behavior and involved in avoiding social punishment
358 (61-63). As HL participants rated the negative social feedback videos as more pleasant than
359 the control participants, reduced NAcc responses to negative social feedback might thus reflect
360 reduced tendencies to avoid this negative social feedback. Furthermore, the enhanced
361 functional coupling of the NAcc with a hippocampal cluster that correlated with individual
362 pleasantness ratings is in line with the involvement of this neural circuit in hedonic processing
363 (64) and might reflect the rewarding experience of a social feedback for socially deprived
364 individuals (65). Nevertheless, we have recently found a compromised neural integration of
365 social information in HL participants evident in various brain regions including the NAcc (37).
366 Furthermore, loneliness has been associated with a reduced recognition of negative vocal
367 expressions (66). Thus, the reduced NAcc activity might also reflect diminished differentiation
368 between positive and negative feedback, resulting in a dysregulated reward system
369 responsiveness to negative social stimuli as observed for the NAcc-hippocampus connectivity.

370 However, inference about cognitive processes from neural activation should always be drawn
371 with restraint (67) and results regarding biased emotion recognition in loneliness are
372 inconclusive (68). Future studies are warranted to further investigate the impact of loneliness
373 on the processing of negative social feedback.

374 Interestingly, differences between HL and control participants were restricted to behavioral and
375 neural responses to negative social feedback, whereas Bayesian analyses revealed evidence

376 for a comparable responsiveness to positive social feedback between groups. Conversely,
377 social anxiety has been consistently found to affect the processing of social rewards (31-34).
378 Previous studies point to various negative effects of loneliness on the processing of positive
379 social interactions (37, 69, 70), but findings about the association between loneliness and NAcc
380 reactivity to positive social stimuli are mixed. The involvement of the NAcc in loneliness might
381 be context-dependent, with feelings of social isolation promoting the hedonic experience of
382 positive social stimuli in an acute stage (65), which may be different from chronic loneliness.
383 Similarly, lonely individuals might experience a social stimulus as more rewarding only if the
384 stimulus is already familiar (e.g. a romantic partner and not a stranger (71)). Along these lines,
385 a recent study found no relationship of loneliness with striatal responsiveness to pictures
386 depicting strangers during positive social interactions (72). Nevertheless, in our task design
387 positive feedback was always coupled with monetary gains. Thus, differences regarding
388 positive social feedback might have been obfuscated by the rewarding experience of earning
389 money as evident in enhanced striatal responsiveness to positive feedback, irrespective of the
390 partner providing the feedback. Both external (e.g., passive viewing of positive social
391 interactions vs. being involved in a positive social interaction) and internal factors (e.g., state
392 vs. chronic feelings of social isolation) may influence the association of loneliness with social
393 reward processing.

394 Moreover, given the quasi-experimental, cross-sectional design of our study, our findings do
395 not allow casual inferences about the relationship of loneliness and social feedback
396 processing. In addition, moderation and mediation analyses indicate that the observed
397 associations with loneliness were not driven by psychiatric symptoms that were also more
398 pronounced in HL individuals. However, our study specifically focused on high-lonely healthy
399 individuals who may represent a resilient subsample of the population because they did not
400 develop acute psychiatric disorders. Thus, clinical studies with psychiatric patients are
401 warranted to uncover the direction of the observed associative relationships and to further
402 disentangle shared and distinct mechanisms underlying loneliness and psychopathology.

403 Collectively, the current results suggest that loneliness and social anxiety are distinct
404 constructs with specific behavioral and neural substrates. Along these lines, interventions
405 targeting loneliness-specific cognitive biases may be more effective in reducing loneliness than
406 cognitive behavioral therapies focused on reducing avoidance behavior.

407

408 **Statements** It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

409

410 **Funding and Disclosure**

411 S.G.S-T, R.H., and D.S. are supported by a German-Israel Foundation for Scientific Research
412 and Development grant (GIF, I-1428-105.4/2017). The authors have no conflicts of interest to
413 declare.

414

415 **Acknowledgement**

416 The authors thank Alexandra Goertzen-Patin for proofreading the manuscript.

417

418 **Author Contributions**

419 J.L., J.S., and D.S. designed the experiment; J.L., T.E., and E.K. conducted the experiments;
420 J.L. and D.S. analyzed the data. All authors wrote the manuscript. All authors read and
421 approved the manuscript in its current version.

422

References

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .

1. Morr M, Lieberz J, Dobbstein M, Philipsen A, Hurlmann R, Scheele D. Insula reactivity mediates subjective isolation stress in alexithymia. *Sci Rep*. 2021;11(1):15326. [10.1038/s41598-021-94799-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-94799-w).
2. Holt-Lunstad J. Why Social Relationships Are Important for Physical Health: A Systems Approach to Understanding and Modifying Risk and Protection. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2018;69:437-58. [10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011902](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011902).
3. Solmi M, Veronese N, Galvano D, Favaro A, Ostinelli EG, Noventa V, et al. Factors Associated With Loneliness: An Umbrella Review Of Observational Studies. *J Affect Disord*. 2020;271:131-8. [10.1016/j.jad.2020.03.075](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.03.075).
4. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Baker M, Harris T, Stephenson D. Loneliness and Social Isolation as Risk Factors for Mortality: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2015;10(2):227-37. [10.1177/1745691614568352](https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352).
5. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Layton JB. Social relationships and mortality risk: A meta-analytic review. *PLoS Med*. 2010;7(7):e1000316. [10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316).
6. Jeste DV, Lee EE, Cacioppo S. Battling the Modern Behavioral Epidemic of Loneliness: Suggestions for Research and Interventions. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020;77(6):553-4. [10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0027](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0027).
7. Mihalopoulos C, Le LK, Chatterton ML, Bucholc J, Holt-Lunstad J, Lim MH, et al. The economic costs of loneliness: A review of cost-of-illness and economic evaluation studies. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2020;55:823-36. [10.1007/s00127-019-01733-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-019-01733-7).
8. Blazer D. Social isolation and loneliness in older adults - a mental health/public health challenge. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020;77(10):990-1. [10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.1054](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.1054).
9. Galea S, Merchant RM, Lurie N. The Mental Health Consequences of COVID-19 and Physical Distancing: The Need for Prevention and Early Intervention. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2020;180(6):817-8. [10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1562](https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.1562).
10. Vindegaard N, Benros ME. COVID-19 pandemic and mental health consequences: Systematic review of the current evidence. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2020;89:531-42. [10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.048](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2020.05.048).
11. Killgore WDS, Cloonan SA, Taylor EC, Lucas DA, Dailey NS. Loneliness during the first half-year of COVID-19 Lockdowns. *Psychiatry Res*. 2020;294:113551. [10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113551](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113551).
12. Losada-Baltar A, Martinez-Huertas JA, Jimenez-Gonzalo L, Pedroso-Chaparro MDS, Gallego-Alberto L, Fernandes-Pires J, et al. Longitudinal correlates of loneliness and

- psychological distress during the lockdown situation due to COVID-19. Effects of age and self-perceptions of aging. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2021:gbab012. 10.1093/geronb/gbab012.
13. Tull MT, Edmonds KA, Scamaldo KM, Richmond JR, Rose JP, Gratz KL. Psychological outcomes associated with stay-at-home orders and the perceived impact of COVID-19 on daily life. *Psychiatry Res*. 2020;289:113098. 10.1016/j.psychres.2020.113098.
 14. Bu F, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Loneliness during a strict lockdown: Trajectories and predictors during the COVID-19 pandemic in 38,217 United Kingdom adults. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020:113521. 10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.113521.
 15. Danneel S, Geukens F, Maes M, Bastin M, Bijttebier P, Colpin H, et al. Loneliness, Social Anxiety Symptoms, and Depressive Symptoms in Adolescence: Longitudinal Distinctiveness and Correlated Change. *J Youth Adolesc*. 2020;49:2246-64. 10.1007/s10964-020-01315-w.
 16. Maes M, Nelemans SA, Danneel S, Fernandez-Castilla B, Van den Noortgate W, Goossens L, et al. Loneliness and social anxiety across childhood and adolescence: Multilevel meta-analyses of cross-sectional and longitudinal associations. *Dev Psychol*. 2019;55(7):1548-64. 10.1037/dev0000719.
 17. Bruce LD, Wu JS, Lustig SL, Russell DW, Nemecek DA. Loneliness in the United States: a 2018 national panel survey of demographic, structural, cognitive, and behavioral characteristics. *Am J Health Promot*. 2019;33(8):1123-33. 10.1177/0890117119856551.
 18. Danneel S, Nelemans S, Spithoven A, Bastin M, Bijttebier P, Colpin H, et al. Internalizing Problems in Adolescence: Linking Loneliness, Social Anxiety Symptoms, and Depressive Symptoms Over Time. *J Abnorm Child Psychol*. 2019;47(10):1691-705. 10.1007/s10802-019-00539-0.
 19. Lim MH, Rodebaugh TL, Zyphur MJ, Gleeson JF. Loneliness over time: The crucial role of social anxiety. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 2016;125(5):620-30. 10.1037/abn0000162.
 20. Li M, Ren Y, Sun H. Social Anxiety Status of Left-Behind Children in Rural Areas of Hunan Province and its Relationship with Loneliness. *Child Psychiatry Hum Dev*. 2020;51(6):1016-24. 10.1007/s10578-020-01045-x.
 21. Teo AR, Lerrigo R, Rogers MA. The role of social isolation in social anxiety disorder: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2013;27(4):353-64. 10.1016/j.janxdis.2013.03.010.
 22. Rapee RM, Peters L, Carpenter L, Gaston JE. The Yin and Yang of support from significant others: Influence of general social support and partner support of avoidance

in the context of treatment for social anxiety disorder. *Behav Res Ther.* 2015;69:40-7.

10.1016/j.brat.2015.03.012.

23. Porter E, Chambless DL. Shying away from a good thing: social anxiety in romantic relationships. *J Clin Psychol.* 2014;70(6):546-61. 10.1002/jclp.22048.
24. Rodebaugh TL, Lim MH, Shumaker EA, Levinson CA, Thompson T. Social Anxiety and Friendship Quality over Time. *Cogn Behav Ther.* 2015;44(6):502-11. 10.1080/16506073.2015.1062043.
25. Peplau LA, Caldwell MA. Loneliness: A cognitive analysis. *Essence.* 1978;2(4):207-20.
26. Evans M, Fisher EB. Social Isolation and Mental Health: The Role of Nondirective and Directive Social Support. *Community Ment Health J.* 2021. 10.1007/s10597-021-00787-9.
27. Cacioppo JT, Cacioppo S. Chapter Three - Loneliness in the Modern Age: An Evolutionary Theory of Loneliness (ETL). In: Olson JM, editor. *Adv Exp Soc Psychol.* 58. Cambridge, MA: Academic Press; 2018. p. 127-97.
28. Clark DM, Wells A. A Cognitive Model of Social Phobia. In: Heimberg RG, Liebowitz MR, Hope DA, Schneider FR, editors. *Social phobia: Diagnosis, assessment, and treatment.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press; 1995. p. 69-94.
29. Bruhl AB, Delsignore A, Komossa K, Weidt S. Neuroimaging in social anxiety disorder- a meta-analytic review resulting in a new neurofunctional model. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 2014;47:260-80. 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.08.003.
30. Etkin A, Wager TD. Functional Neuroimaging of Anxiety: A Meta-Analysis of Emotional Processing in PTSD, Social Anxiety Disorder, and Specific Phobia. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2007;164(10):1476-88. 10.1176/appi.ajp.2007.07030504.
31. Schultz J, Willems T, Gadeke M, Chakkour G, Franke A, Weber B, et al. A human subcortical network underlying social avoidance revealed by risky economic choices. *eLife.* 2019;8:e45249. 10.7554/eLife.45249.
32. Richey JA, Ghane M, Valdespino A, Coffman MC, Stregre MV, White SW, et al. Spatiotemporal dissociation of brain activity underlying threat and reward in social anxiety disorder. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci.* 2017;12(1):81-94. 10.1093/scan/nsw149.
33. Richey JA, Rittenberg A, Hughes L, Damiano CR, Sabatino A, Miller S, et al. Common and distinct neural features of social and non-social reward processing in autism and social anxiety disorder. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci.* 2014;9(3):367-77. 10.1093/scan/nss146.
34. Sripada C, Angstadt M, Liberzon I, McCabe K, Phan KL. Aberrant reward center response to partner reputation during a social exchange game in generalized social phobia. *Depress Anxiety.* 2013;30(4):353-61. 10.1002/da.22091.

35. Kashdan TB, Collins RL. Social anxiety and the experience of positive emotion and anger in everyday life: an ecological momentary assessment approach. *Anxiety Stress Coping*. 2010;23(3):259-72. 10.1080/10615800802641950.
36. Romano M, Tran E, Moscovitch DA. Social anxiety is associated with impaired memory for imagined social events with positive outcomes. *Cogn Emot*. 2020;34(4):700-12. 10.1080/02699931.2019.1675596.
37. Lieberz J, Shamay-Tsoory SG, Saporta N, Esser T, Kuskova E, Stoffel-Wagner B, et al. Loneliness and the social brain: how perceived social isolation impairs human interactions. *bioRxiv [Internet]*. 2021:[2021.03.03.433569 p.]. Available from: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/biorxiv/early/2021/03/03/2021.03.03.433569.full.pdf>.
38. Lam JA, Murray ER, Yu KE, Ramsey M, Nguyen TT, Mishra J, et al. Neurobiology of loneliness: a systematic review. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2021. 10.1038/s41386-021-01058-7.
39. Russell D, Peplau LA, Cutrona CE. The Revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and Discriminant Validity Evidence. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1980;39(3):472-80.
40. Kaulard K, Cunningham DW, Bulthoff HH, Wallraven C. The MPI facial expression database--a validated database of emotional and conversational facial expressions. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(3):e32321. 10.1371/journal.pone.0032321.
41. Maldjian JA, Laurienti PJ, Burdette JH. Precentral gyrus discrepancy in electronic versions of the Talairach atlas. *Neuroimage*. 2004;21(1):450-5. 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.09.032.
42. Maldjian JA, Laurienti PJ, Kraft RA, Burdette JH. An automated method for neuroanatomic and cytoarchitectonic atlas-based interrogation of fMRI data sets. *Neuroimage*. 2003;19(3):1233-9. 10.1016/s1053-8119(03)00169-1.
43. Hebart MN, Gorgen K, Haynes JD. The Decoding Toolbox (TDT): a versatile software package for multivariate analyses of functional imaging data. *Front Neuroinform*. 2014;8:88. 10.3389/fninf.2014.00088.
44. Beck A, Steer RA, Brown GK. Beck Depression Inventory-II. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation; 1996.
45. Liebowitz MR. Social phobia. *Mod Probl Pharmacopsychiatry*. 1987;22:141-73.
46. Bernstein DP, Fink L, Handelsman L, Foote J, Lovejoy M, Wenzel K, et al. Initial Reliability and Validity of a New Retrospective Measure of Child Abuse and Neglect. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1994;151(8):1132-6. 10.1176/ajp.151.8.1132.
47. JASP Team. JASP (Version 0.14.1)[Computer software]. <https://jasp-stats.org/2020>.

48. Phelps EA, LeDoux JE. Contributions of the Amygdala to Emotion Processing: From Animal Models to Human Behavior. *Neuron*. 2005;48(2):175-87. 10.1016/j.neuron.2005.09.025.
49. Björkstrand J, Agren T, Frick A, Hjorth O, Furmark T, Fredrikson M, et al. Decrease in amygdala activity during repeated exposure to spider images predicts avoidance behavior in spider fearful individuals. *Translational Psychiatry*. 2020;10(1). 10.1038/s41398-020-00887-2.
50. Lisk S, Kadosh KC, Zich C, Haller SP, Lau JY. Training negative connectivity patterns between the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and amygdala through fMRI-based neurofeedback to target adolescent socially-avoidant behaviour. *Behav Res Ther*. 2020;135:103760. 10.1016/j.brat.2020.103760.
51. Mao Y, Zuo XN, Ding C, Qiu J. OFC and its connectivity with amygdala as predictors for future social anxiety in adolescents. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*. 2020;44:100804. 10.1016/j.dcn.2020.100804.
52. Tian X, Hou X, Wang K, Wei D, Qiu J. Neuroanatomical correlates of individual differences in social anxiety in a non-clinical population. *Soc Neurosci*. 2016;11(4):424-37. 10.1080/17470919.2015.1091037.
53. Spithoven AWM, Cacioppo S, Goossens L, Cacioppo JT. Genetic contributions to loneliness and their relevance to the evolutionary theory of loneliness. *Perspect Psychol Sci*. 2019;14(3):376-96. 10.1177/1745691618812684.
54. Masi CM, Chen HY, Hawkey LC, Cacioppo JT. A meta-analysis of interventions to reduce loneliness. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*. 2011;15(3):219-66. 10.1177/1088868310377394.
55. Veronese N, Galvano D, D'Antiga F, Vecchiato C, Furegon E, Allocco R, et al. Interventions for reducing loneliness: An umbrella review of intervention studies. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2020;00:1-8. 10.1111/hsc.13248.
56. O'Day EB, Butler RM, Morrison AS, Goldin PR, Gross JJ, Heimberg RG. Reductions in social anxiety during treatment predict lower levels of loneliness during follow-up among individuals with social anxiety disorder. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2021;78:102362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2021.102362>.
57. Alfano CA, Pina AA, Villalta IK, Beidel DC, Ammerman RT, Crosby LE. Mediators and moderators of outcome in the behavioral treatment of childhood social phobia. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2009;48(9):945-53. 10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181af8216.
58. Suveg C, Kingery JN, Davis M, Jones A, Whitehead M, Jacob ML. Still lonely: Social adjustment of youth with and without social anxiety disorder following cognitive behavioral therapy. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2017;52:72-8. 10.1016/j.janxdis.2017.10.005.

59. Haslam C, Cruwys T, Chang MX, Bentley SV, Haslam SA, Dingle GA, et al. GROUPS 4 HEALTH reduces loneliness and social anxiety in adults with psychological distress: findings from a randomized controlled trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2019;87(9):787-801. 10.1037/ccp0000427.
60. Kall A, Back M, Welin C, Aman H, Bjerkander R, Wanman M, et al. Therapist-Guided Internet-Based Treatments for Loneliness: A Randomized Controlled Three-Arm Trial Comparing Cognitive Behavioral Therapy and Interpersonal Psychotherapy. *Psychother Psychosom*. 2021:1-8. 10.1159/000516989.
61. Floresco SB. The nucleus accumbens: an interface between cognition, emotion, and action. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2015;66:25-52. 10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115159.
62. Kohls G, Perino MT, Taylor JM, Madva EN, Cayless SJ, Troiani V, et al. The nucleus accumbens is involved in both the pursuit of social reward and the avoidance of social punishment. *Neuropsychologia*. 2013;51(11):2062-9. 10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.07.020.
63. Damiano CR, Cockrell DC, Dunlap K, Hanna EK, Miller S, Bizzell J, et al. Neural mechanisms of negative reinforcement in children and adolescents with autism spectrum disorders. *J Neurodev Disord*. 2015;7:12. 10.1186/s11689-015-9107-8.
64. Yang AK, Mendoza JA, Lafferty CK, Lacroix F, Britt JP. Hippocampal Input to the Nucleus Accumbens Shell Enhances Food Palatability. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2020;87(7):597-608. 10.1016/j.biopsych.2019.09.007.
65. Tomova L, Wang KL, Thompson T, Matthews GA, Takahashi A, Tye KM, et al. Acute social isolation evokes midbrain craving responses similar to hunger. *Nat Neurosci*. 2020;23:1597-605. 10.1038/s41593-020-00742-z.
66. Morningstar M, Nowland R, Dirks MA, Qualter P. Loneliness and the recognition of vocal socioemotional expressions in adolescence. *Cogn Emot*. 2020;34(5):970-6. 10.1080/02699931.2019.1682971.
67. Poldrack RA. Can cognitive processes be inferred from neuroimaging data? *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2006;10(2):59-63. 10.1016/j.tics.2005.12.004.
68. Spithoven AWM, Bijttebier P, Goossens L. It is all in their mind: A review on information processing bias in lonely individuals. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2017;58:97-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2017.10.003>.
69. Cacioppo JT, Norris CJ, Decety J, Monteleone G, Nusbaum H. In the Eye of the Beholder: Individual Differences in Perceived Social Isolation Predict Regional Brain Activation to Social Stimuli. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2009;21(1):83-92. 10.1162/jocn.2009.21007.

70. Silva HD, Campagnoli RR, Mota BEF, Araujo GBV, Alvares RSR, Mocaiber I, et al. Bonding Pictures: Affective Ratings Are Specifically Associated to Loneliness But Not to Empathy. *Front Psychol.* 2017;8:1136. 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01136.
71. Inagaki TK, Muscatell KA, Moieni M, Dutcher JM, Jevtic I, Irwin MR, et al. Yearning for connection? Loneliness is associated with increased ventral striatum activity to close others. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci.* 2016;11(7):1096-101. 10.1093/scan/nsv076.
72. D'Agostino AE, Kattan D, Canli T. An fMRI study of loneliness in younger and older adults. *Soc Neurosci.* 2018:1-13. 10.1080/17470919.2018.1445027.