medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Research Article

Altered reward network responses to social touch in major depression

Clemens Mielacher[1,*], Dirk Scheele[1,2], Maximilian Kiebs[1], Laura Schmitt[1], Torge Dellert[3], Alexandra Philipsen[4], Claus Lamm[5], René Hurlemann[1,2,6]

[1] Research Section Medical Psychology, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Hospital Bonn, Bonn, Germany

[2] Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine & Health Sciences, University of Oldenburg, Bad Zwischenahn, Germany

[3] Institute of Medical Psychology and Systems Neuroscience, University of Münster, Münster, Germany

[4] Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Hospital Bonn, Bonn, Germany

[5] Social, Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience Unit, Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

[6] Research Center Neurosensory Science, University of Oldenburg, Oldenburg Germany

Short title: Social touch in major depression

[*] Corresponding author: Clemens Mielacher

Research Section Medical Psychology, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Hospital Bonn

Venusberg-Campus 1, 53127 Bonn, Germany

Email: cmielach@mailbox.org

Number of tables: 1, Number of figures: 3, Word count: 4198

Keywords: Major depressive disorder, social touch, reward, striatum, fMRI

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Introduction: Affective touch is highly rewarding and an integral part of social relationships. Major depressive disorder (MDD) is characterized by severe impairments in reward processing, but the neural effects of social touch in MDD are still elusive.

Objective: We aimed to determine whether the neural processing of social touch is impaired in MDD and to assess the impact of antidepressant therapy.

Methods: Before and after antidepressant treatment, 53 MDD patients and 41 healthy controls underwent functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) while receiving social touch. We compared neural responses to social touch in the reward network, behavioral ratings of touch comfort and general aversion to interpersonal touch in MDD patients to controls. Additionally, we examined the effect of treatment response on those measures.

Results: Clinical symptoms decreased after treatment and 43.4% of patients were classified as responders. Patients reported higher aversion to social touch and lower comfort ratings during the fMRI paradigm than controls. Patients showed reduced responses to social touch in the nucleus accumbens, caudate nucleus and putamen than controls, both before and after treatment. Non-responders exhibited blunted response in the caudate nucleus and the insula compared to responders, again irrespective of treatment.

Conclusions: These findings confirm our hypothesis that interpersonal touch as an indicator of social reward processing is impaired in MDD. Persistent dysfunctional processing of social touch despite clinical improvements may constitute a latent risk factor for social withdrawal and isolation. New treatment approaches are necessary to specifically target social reward processing and disturbed body awareness in MDD.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Major depressive disorder (MDD) is one of the most common mental disorders and a leading cause of years lived with disability [1]. A core symptom of MDD, according to both DSM-V and ICD-10 criteria, is anhedonia, an array of deficits impacting various hedonic functions such as desire, motivation and pleasure [2]. Patients suffering from anhedonia show overall poorer treatment response [3,4], possibly because established pharmacotherapies, particularly selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), are not well suited to treat motivational and reward-related dysfunctions in depression [5,6]. On a neurobiological level, anhedonia has been associated with the reward network (for an overview, see ref. [7]). Meta-analytical evidence from neuroimaging studies shows that patients with MDD exhibit reduced responses to monetary incentives and happy faces in various reward network nodes, such as the nucleus accumbens, caudate, putamen, insula and orbitofrontal cortex [8–10]. Moreover, higher reward sensitivity is associated with better outcome after psychotherapeutic interventions. [11]

Social interactions are considered natural rewards [12] and activate the reward network in healthy participants [13–16]. Even though MDD patients often suffer from impairments in social functioning (for an overview, see [17]), few studies have probed the processing of social reward in MDD [18,19]. For instance, social touch can be inherently rewarding and is an integral part of nonverbal social communication and bonding [20,21], but it is still elusive whether MDD also modulates the processing of rewarding interpersonal, tactile stimulation.

Social distancing measures in the era of COVID-19 have vividly demonstrated the importance of interpersonal touch and the consequences of its absence. Social touch deprivation during the pandemic has been linked to increased anxiety and loneliness and resulted in a craving for interpersonal touch [22,23]. The processing of touch is mediated by different pathways in the nervous system. Myelinated Aβ-fibers enable rapid central processing and convey discriminative information, allowing for prompt responses to a stimulus. These fibers are activated by fast tactile stimulation, whereas unmyelinated C-tactile (CT) afferents respond to slow, caressing stimulation that corresponds to rewarding and affective properties of touch [24]. Social touch is intrinsically rewarding [25,26] and its rewarding nature seems to be mediated by the endogenous opioid system, in particular by the μ-opioid receptor system, which is involved in both non-social [27,28] and social reward [18,29–31]. In healthy participants, social touch increases μ-opioid receptor activity in the striatum and the insula among other regions [32], and opioid receptor antagonists modulate the motivation to obtain social touch [33] and its perceived pleasantness [34]. Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) studies provide further evidence for the effect of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

interpersonal touch on the reward circuit. Being touched by another person, but not self-produced touch, increases neural activation in the caudate nucleus [35]. Intranasal oxytocin, a neuropeptide crucially involved in social bonding, increases nucleus accumbens activity when participants believe they are being touched by their romantic partner [36]. Similarly, increased pleasantness ratings and striatal activity have been observed when heterosexual male participants believe social touch is being delivered by a female as opposed to a male experimenter [37,38]. Striatal response to affective touch seems to increase with age [39].

The rationale of the present study was to probe whether MDD is associated with impaired processing of social touch as an indicator of social reward. We therefore examined patients with MDD before and after a multi-week course of antidepressant treatment and compared them to healthy controls who were examined over the same period. We employed a social touch fMRI paradigm, during which participants rated the comfort of affective (i.e., slow) and discriminative (i.e., fast) touch. Additionally, we assessed depressive symptom severity over the course of the study in MDD patients. We expected MDD patients to perceive social touch as less comfortable and to display decreased neural responses to social touch in reward-associated regions compared to healthy controls, particularly in the nucleus accumbens, caudate nucleus, putamen and insula. We further hypothesized that these MDD-related impairments would decrease after treatment. Since anhedonia is associated with worse treatment outcome, we expected that non-responders to antidepressant therapy would report lower comfort ratings and exhibit lower neural responses to social touch compared to responders. We assumed that these effects would be particularly pronounced in response to slow affective as opposed to fast discriminative touch.

Materials and Methods

Participants and study design

Between June 2016 and April 2018, 53 patients with MDD (27 female, age 41.58 ± 13.09 years) and 41 healthy controls (22 female, age 40.61 ± 13.22 years) participated in this study (Table 1). To participate in this registered study (https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT04081519), all patients had to meet DSM-IV criteria for unipolar MDD as diagnosed by an experienced psychiatrist and verified by the Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) [40], and were in-patients at the Department of Psychiatry, University Hospital Bonn, Germany. Exclusion criteria for all participants were suicidal ideation, psychotic symptoms, bipolar depression, substance abuse, eating disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder, personality disorders, neurological disorders and MRI contraindications. For healthy controls, additional exclusion criteria were any lifetime axis I or II psychiatric disorders and any past or

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

current psychopharmacological medication. To assess a possible history of abuse and neglect, we administered the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ) [41]. General attitude toward touch was assessed using a Social Touch Questionnaire (STQ) [42].

Patients underwent MRI scanning within 1–3 days after admission to the clinic and, again, 24 days later; accordingly, controls were examined twice at the same interval. For the duration of the study, patients received treatment according to current guidelines for MDD [43] (cf. supplementary information). To quantify clinical improvement, trained raters assessed depressive symptom severity on a weekly basis using the 17-item Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS-17) [44]. As a measure of self-assessed depression severity, the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II) [45] was administered before and after the treatment course and every four weeks over a 12-week follow-up period.

Social touch paradigm

For the fMRI scans, we employed an adapted version of an established paradigm [46,47], in which tactile stimulation was manually applied to participants at different speed levels. Stimulation was administered by an experimenter who performed vertical strokes with cotton gloved hands over 20-cm zones on the participants' shins that were marked prior to the fMRI scan. During the 4-s touch, the complete zone was covered either with a single stroke at a speed of 5 cm/s (slow, affective touch) or with four repeated strokes at a speed of 20 cm/s (fast, discriminative touch). Slow is experienced as more pleasant than fast touch [48] and specifically elicits responses by CT afferents, which are associated with rewarding properties of touch [24]. The experimenter was trained to keep stimulation pressure constant at both speed levels and received audio cues via headphones during the experiment to ensure constant stimulation velocity. No stimulation occurred during the no touch control condition. Each condition was repeated 20 times in randomized order. Each trial was initiated with the presentation of a white fixation cross (3 s). Fast and slow touch trials were then announced by the color of the fixation cross changing to blue (1 s). After each trial, the participant rated the comfort of the tactile stimulation on a 100-point visual analogue scale that ranged from not at all comfortable (0) to very comfortable (100) and was presented for a maximum of 5 s. To minimize context effects, participants were not informed about the identity of the person administering the stimulation and the opening of the scanner was covered with a blanket during the experiment.

MRI data acquisition

Functional and structural MRI data were acquired on a 1.5 T Siemens Avanto MRI system (Siemens, Erlangen, Germany) equipped with a 12-channel standard head coil at the Life & Brain Centre, Bonn,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Germany. T2*-weighted gradient-echo planar images (EPI) images with blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) contrast were acquired during the social touch task (voxel size = 3×3×3 mm; TR = 3000 ms; TE = 50 ms; flip angle = 90°; FoV = 192 mm, matrix size = 64×64; 35 axial slices; ascending slice order with interslice gap of 0.3 mm). The first five volumes of each functional time series were discarded to allow for T1 equilibration. Additionally, a field map (voxel size = 3×3×3 mm; TR = 460 ms; TE_{fast} = 4.76 ms; TE_{slow} = 9.52 ms; flip angle = 60°; matrix size = 64×64; 35 axial slices; interslice gap of 0.3 mm) was acquired to correct for inhomogeneities of the magnetic field during preprocessing. Subsequently, a high-resolution structural image was acquired using a T1-weighted 3D MRI sequence (voxel size = 1×1×1 mm; TR = 1660 ms; TE = 3.09 ms; flip angle = 15°; FoV = 256 mm; matrix size = 256×256, 160 sagittal slices).

Data analysis

Data analyses focused on the comparison of patients with healthy controls and on differences between responders and non-responders to antidepressant treatment. The criterion for clinical response was defined as a ≥ 50% reduction in HDRS-17 scores.

The fMRI data were preprocessed and analyzed using SPM12 software (Wellcome Trust Center for Neuroimaging, London, UK; http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm) running in MATLAB R2010b (The MathWorks, Natick, MA). The functional data were realigned, initially to the first image in the time series, then to the mean of all images, and unwarped using the field map data. They were then coregistered to the anatomical volume acquired pre-treatment and normalized based on probabilistic tissue segmentation into 2-mm stereotaxic Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space. Subsequently, the images were smoothed using a 4-mm full width at half maximum (FWHM) Gaussian kernel. Two patients and one control had to be excluded from further fMRI analysis due to excessive head movement (> 3 mm or °) during data acquisition. This resulted in a sample size of 51 patients and 40 controls. A two-level random effects approach based on the general linear model as implemented in SPM12 was used for statistical analysis. After preprocessing, conditions based on combinations of stimulus (fast touch, slow touch) and time (pre-treatment, post-treatment) were entered into a GLM for each participant together with a constant term and six realignment parameters per session to account for subject motion. On the first level, we subtracted the respective no touch control regressor from the experimental regressors for each participant and condition. On the second level, we conducted two separate analyses of variance (ANOVA) to compare patients with controls, and responders with non-responders. For each analysis, we entered the first level contrasts in separate flexible factorial models to compute the within-subject main effects of speed (fast touch, slow touch) and time (pre-treatment, post-treatment), the between-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

subjects main effects of group (patients, controls) or response (responders, non-responders), and their respective interactions. For each analysis, we used multiple models to partition variance in SPM as recommended when using group-level repeated measurement designs [49].

To validate the effect of the social touch paradigm, we performed a whole-brain analysis of the control group with an initial height threshold of $p < .001$. Peak-level p-values were then family-wise error (FWE) corrected for multiple comparisons and $p < .05$ was considered significant.

The main analysis focused on a set of bilateral a priori defined regions of interest consisting of the nucleus accumbens, caudate nucleus, putamen and anterior and posterior insula. These regions were defined based on the automated anatomical labelling atlas 3 [50]. The peak-level threshold for significance was set to $p < .05$, FWE-corrected for multiple comparisons based on the size of each region of interest.

Behavioral data were analyzed using SPSS Statistics Version 27 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA) and all tests were two-tailed. To test for clinical improvement, a repeated measures ANOVA was performed for HDRS-17 ratings. In line with the fMRI analyses, we conducted separate mixed-design ANOVAs of social touch comfort ratings with touch speed (slow, fast) and time (pre-treatment, post-treatment) as within-subject factors and either group (patients, controls) or response (responders, non-responders) as a between-subjects factor to compare patients with controls or responders with non-responders, respectively. The threshold for significance was set to $p < .05$, and p-values were Bonferroni-adjusted if appropriate (P_{corr}). Greenhouse-Geisser correction was applied in cases of lack of sphericity. A moderation analysis was conducted to examine the effect of potential confounders (age, sex, CTQ scores) on our analyses (cf. supplementary information). Partial eta-squared and Cohen's d were calculated as measures of effect size. Pearson's product-moment correlation was used to test associations between fMRI peak-voxel parameter estimates from the region of interest analysis and comfort ratings, social touch aversion, HDRS-17 baseline scores and HDRS-17 item number 7 as a measure of baseline anhedonia. This item assesses "loss of interest in activities", "decrease in actual time spent on activities" and "experiencing pleasure" [44].

Results

Behavioral results

Analysis of HDRS-17 scores (shown in Fig. 1) showed a significant reduction over time ($F_{(2.59, 134.89)} = 36.82$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.42$) in patients, 23 (43.4%) of whom met the criterion for a clinical response.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Analysis of social touch comfort ratings revealed main effects of speed ($F_{(1, 92)} = 99.46$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.52$) and group ($F_{(1, 92)} = 7.12$, $p = .009$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.07$, shown in Fig. 1). As expected, comfort ratings were higher after slow, affective touch than after fast, discriminative touch. Patients overall rated social touch as less comfortable than control participants. A trend toward an interaction between group and speed ($F_{(1, 92)} = 3.70$, $p = .058$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.04$) indicated that this difference was only present after fast ($t_{(92)} = 3.06$, $p_{corr} = .012$, $d = 0.64$) but not slow touch ($t_{(92)} = 0.79$, $p_{corr} > .999$, $d = 0.16$). The analysis comparing responders and non-responders also revealed a significant main effect of speed ($F_{(1, 51)} = 70.86$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.58$) with higher comfort ratings for slow touch, but no other significant main effects or interactions.

Patients reported a higher aversion to social touch as measured by STQ scores than controls ($t_{(89.88)} = 4.89$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.97$), while no difference was found between responders and non-responders ($t_{(51)} = 0.08$, $p = .936$, $d = 0.02$).

fMRI results

In the control group, social touch relative to the no touch control condition revealed widespread activations in touch-processing networks at the whole-brain level including the insula, somatosensory cortex and supramarginal gyrus [51] (cf. supplementary information, Table S1).

In the region of interest analysis, patients showed diminished neural response to interpersonal touch irrespective of touch velocity and time (pre vs. post treatment) in the bilateral nucleus accumbens (peak MNI coordinates (x, y, z): −6, 16, −4; $F_{(1, 89)} = 15.59$, $p_{FWE} = .010$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.14$; MNI: 4, 14, −2; $F_{(1, 89)} = 11.68$, $p_{FWE} = .041$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.11$; shown in Fig. 2A) and in the bilateral caudate nucleus (MNI: −14, 20, 12; $F_{(1, 89)} = 21.88$, $p_{FWE} = .005$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.19$; MNI: 10, 10, 14; $F_{(1, 89)} = 21.64$, $p_{FWE} = .006$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.20$; shown in Fig. 2B) compared to controls. Reduced activity in both regions was associated with a general aversion toward social touch as assessed by the STQ (left nucleus accumbens: $r_{(89)} = -0.28$, $p = .008$; right caudate nucleus: $r_{(89)} = -0.25$, $p = .017$). Responses in the bilateral caudate nucleus negatively correlated with baseline anhedonia in patients (left: $r_{(49)} = -0.44$, $p = .001$; right: $r_{(49)} = -0.32$, $p = .021$). Since none of the correlations survived Bonferroni correction, the results should be interpreted with caution. Furthermore, we found a significant interaction between speed, time and group in the left putamen (MNI: −28, 0, 2; $F_{(1, 89)} = 19.23$, $p_{FWE} = .016$, $\eta_p^2 = 0.18$). Post-hoc tests revealed decreased responses to fast touch in patients compared to controls at baseline ($t_{(89)} = 3.06$, $p_{corr} = .036$, $d = 0.65$) but not after treatment ($t_{(89)} = 0.38$, $p_{corr} > .999$, $d = 0.08$).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Secondly, we examined the effect of treatment response. The main effect of treatment response indicated reduced activity during social touch in the right caudate nucleus (MNI: 22, 20, 12; $F_{(1, 49)}$ = 17.86, p_{FWE} = .039, η_p^2 = 0.26, shown in Fig. 3A) in non-responders compared to responders. A significant interaction between speed and group in the left anterior insula (MNI: -26, 26, 2; $F_{(1, 49)}$ = 20.01, p_{FWE} = .022, η_p^2 = 0.30, shown in Fig. 3B) showed that non-responders exhibited reduced activation during slow touch compared to responders ($t_{(49)}$ = 3.75, p_{corr} = .002, d = 1.06), but not during fast touch ($t_{(49)}$ = 0.01, p_{corr} > .999, d < 0.01). For the interaction of speed, time and group, we found two significant clusters in the right putamen (MNI: 32, -2, -8; $F_{(1, 49)}$ = 19.33, p_{FWE} = .032, η_p^2 = 0.28; MNI: 30, -6, 10; $F_{(1, 49)}$ = 18.20, p_{FWE} = .046, η_p^2 = 0.27). Post-hoc tests revealed no significant effects after Bonferroni correction (all p_{corr} > 0.05). See supplementary information for main effects of time and speed.

The observed behavioral and neural effects of group were not significantly moderated by age or sex. We only found a significant suppressor effect of CTQ scores for the group effect on nucleus accumbens responses to social touch (cf. Supplement).

Discussion/Conclusion

In the present study, we examined the processing of social touch as an indicator of social reward in depression. Confirming our first hypothesis, MDD patients reported a higher aversion to interpersonal touch, experienced it as less comfortable and exhibited reduced neural activation in the reward network compared to healthy controls. Specifically, we found decreased responses to social touch in the nucleus accumbens, caudate nucleus and putamen. Contrary to our expectations, the differences in the nucleus accumbens and caudate nucleus persisted even after treatment. In line with our second hypothesis, non-responders to antidepressant treatment displayed reduced activation in the caudate nucleus, anterior insula and putamen.

Unexpectedly, patients reported decreased comfort ratings compared to controls only after fast touch. This is in line with a study examining the effects of childhood maltreatment on the processing of social touch [46] and could be related to the specific rating of comfort instead of pleasantness [52]. Neural effects in the nucleus accumbens and caudate nucleus were independent of touch velocity, indicating that MDD-related impairments in reward-associated brain structures are not restricted to social touch with C tactile-optimized velocity. However, in line with our hypothesis, non-responders exhibited reduced reactivity in the insula specifically during slow touch compared to responders.

These findings corroborate the assumption that the processing of social reward in general [18,19,53] and of interpersonal touch in particular is impaired in MDD patients. The reported aversion to social touch in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

everyday life could indicate that diminished reward-associated responses to social touch could contribute to the emergence and reinforcement of social isolation in depression. MDD patients typically withdraw from their social circles, thus leading to smaller social network size [54,55] and increased loneliness [56,57], which is associated with more severe symptoms and a worse prognosis [58,59]. This disruption of social functioning can have devastating consequences, as both social isolation and loss of social support have been linked to suicidal outcomes [60,61].

Evidently, interpersonal touch is a crucial component of romantic relationships [62]. Impaired touch-associated reward might blunt the drive to seek physical closeness or even result in an avoidance of interpersonal touch, which could negatively affect sexuality and the overall satisfaction in romantic relationships [63–65]. Eventually, this might lead to separation, which is again a predictor for worse illness trajectories [66,67] and increased risk for suicidal behaviors [60].

Notably, the observed alterations of activity in the nucleus accumbens and caudate nucleus did not change over the treatment course. This could suggest a stable, phenotypical trait characterizing MDD patients that persists even after clinical improvement. This is in line with observations in remitted MDD patients who exhibit lasting impairments both in behavioral [68,69] and neural markers of reward processing [70–72], consistent with the persistence of anhedonia even after recovery from depression [73,74]. Correspondingly, we found a positive association between the response to social touch in the bilateral caudate nucleus and a marker for anhedonia in our data. Another explanation for the persistence of the impairments might be the relatively short time between the two fMRI sessions. While depressive symptoms went down by 40.4% across participants, a longer observation period perhaps would have allowed for further clinical improvement and behavioral adaptations. Likewise, a more pronounced impairment for slow touch was only evident in non-responders to treatment.

Considering the effect of response, we found reduced caudate nucleus and insula activation during social touch in non-responders both before and after treatment, indicating that those who show stronger impairments in striatal and insular reward processing might be less responsive to established antidepressant treatment, both in terms of clinical recovery and normalization of dysfunctional processing of social rewards. In the light of the devastating consequences that can arise from social isolation, this emphasizes the need for targeted interventions that focus on reward processing deficits. For instance, behavioral activation therapy [75] has been shown to be effective in the treatment of depression [76] and seems to affect striatal responses [77]. Furthermore, body-based interventions in

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the form of massage therapy [78] and body psychotherapy [79] are promising approaches to specifically target disturbed body awareness and desynchronization in depression [80,81].

Our findings should be interpreted in light of some limitations. Reward network activation during touch is in line with studies in healthy controls using various kinds of social touch conditions [32,35,37,38], but future studies are warranted to explore whether the observed impairments in MDD are specific to social touch or extend to the processing of non-social tactile stimulation. In addition, antidepressant treatment in this study was naturalistic and heterogeneous, and its particular influence on our findings therefore remains uncertain. However, the treatment was in line with current guidelines for the therapy of depression reflecting clinical realities.

In conclusion, our findings elucidate the role of social reward processing in depression and may help to refine the understanding of anhedonia, a core symptom of depression. Collectively, our results demonstrate an impairment of the experienced comfort of and neural response to social touch in patients with MDD. Moreover, these effects may constitute a risk factor for non-response and may persist even after recovery, leading to ongoing disruptions in social functioning. Future studies should corroborate these findings and might inform new treatment avenues targeting social reward and disturbances of body awareness.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Paul Jung for his programming assistance as well as Anna Metzner, Lara Graute and Lea Köster for their help with data acquisition.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

[1] James SL, Abate D, Abate KH, Abay SM, Abbafati C, Abbasi N, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. The Lancet 2018;392:1789–858. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32279-7.

[2] Rizvi SJ, Pizzagalli DA, Sproule BA, Kennedy SH. Assessing anhedonia in depression: Potentials and pitfalls. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 2016;65:21–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.03.004.

[3] Spijker J, Bijl RV, Graaf RD, Nolen WA. Determinants of poor 1-year outcome of DSM-III-R major depression in the general population: results of the Netherlands Mental Health Survey and Incidence Study (NEMESIS). Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 2001;103:122–30. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0447.2001.103002122.x.

[4] Vrieze E, Demyttenaere K, Bruffaerts R, Hermans D, Pizzagalli DA, Sienaert P, et al. Dimensions in major depressive disorder and their relevance for treatment outcome. Journal of Affective Disorders 2014;155:35–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.10.020.

[5] Dunlop BW, Nemeroff CB. The Role of Dopamine in the Pathophysiology of Depression. Archives of General Psychiatry 2007;64:327–37. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.64.3.327.

[6] McCabe C, Mishor Z, Cowen PJ, Harmer CJ. Diminished Neural Processing of Aversive and Rewarding Stimuli During Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor Treatment. Biological Psychiatry 2010;67:439–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.11.001.

[7] Höflich A, Michenthaler P, Kasper S, Lanzenberger R. Circuit Mechanisms of Reward, Anhedonia, and Depression. International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology 2019;22:105–18. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyy081.

[8] Ng TH, Alloy LB, Smith DV. Meta-analysis of reward processing in major depressive disorder reveals distinct abnormalities within the reward circuit. Transl Psychiatry 2019;9:1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-019-0644-x.

[9] Zhang W-N, Chang S-H, Guo L-Y, Zhang K-L, Wang J. The neural correlates of reward-related processing in major depressive disorder: A meta-analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging studies. Journal of Affective Disorders 2013;151:531–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.06.039.

[10] Keren H, O'Callaghan G, Vidal-Ribas P, Buzzell GA, Brotman MA, Leibenluft E, et al. Reward Processing in Depression: A Conceptual and Meta-Analytic Review Across fMRI and EEG Studies. AJP 2018;175:1111–20. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.17101124.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[11] Papalini S, Lange I, Bakker J, Michielse S, Marcelis M, Wichers M, et al. The predictive value of neural reward processing on exposure therapy outcome: Results from a randomized controlled trial. Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry 2019;92:339–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2019.02.002.

[12] Insel TR. Is social attachment an addictive disorder? Physiology & Behavior 2003;79:351–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9384(03)00148-3.

[13] Alkire D, Levitas D, Warnell KR, Redcay E. Social interaction recruits mentalizing and reward systems in middle childhood. Human Brain Mapping 2018;39:3928–42. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24221.

[14] Izuma K, Saito DN, Sadato N. Processing of Social and Monetary Rewards in the Human Striatum. Neuron 2008;58:284–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2008.03.020.

[15] Kawamichi H, Sugawara SK, Hamano YH, Makita K, Kochiyama T, Sadato N. Increased frequency of social interaction is associated with enjoyment enhancement and reward system activation. Sci Rep 2016;6:24561. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep24561.

[16] Redcay E, Dodell-Feder D, Pearrow MJ, Mavros PL, Kleiner M, Gabrieli JDE, et al. Live face-to-face interaction during fMRI: A new tool for social cognitive neuroscience. NeuroImage 2010;50:1639–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.01.052.

[17] Kupferberg A, Bicks L, Hasler G. Social functioning in major depressive disorder. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews 2016;69:313–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.07.002.

[18] Hsu DT, Sanford BJ, Meyers KK, Love TM, Hazlett KE, Walker SJ, et al. It still hurts: altered endogenous opioid activity in the brain during social rejection and acceptance in major depressive disorder. Mol Psychiatry 2015;20:193–200. https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2014.185.

[19] Olino TM, Silk JS, Osterritter C, Forbes EE. Social Reward in Youth at Risk for Depression: A Preliminary Investigation of Subjective and Neural Differences. Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychopharmacology 2015;25:711–21. https://doi.org/10.1089/cap.2014.0165.

[20] Hertenstein MJ, Verkamp JM, Kerestes AM, Holmes RM. The Communicative Functions of Touch in Humans, Nonhuman Primates, and Rats: A Review and Synthesis of the Empirical Research. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs 2006;132:5–94. https://doi.org/10.3200/MONO.132.1.5-94.

[21] Morrison I, Löken LS, Olausson H. The skin as a social organ. Experimental Brain Research 2010;204:305–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-009-2007-y.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[22] von Mohr M, Kirsch LP, Fotopoulou A. Social touch deprivation during COVID-19: effects on psychological wellbeing and craving interpersonal touch. Royal Society Open Science 2021;8:210287. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.210287.

[23] Banerjee D, Vasquez V, Pecchio M, Hegde ML, Ks Jagannatha R, Rao TS. Biopsychosocial intersections of social/affective touch and psychiatry: Implications of 'touch hunger' during COVID-19. Int J Soc Psychiatry 2021:0020764021997485. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020764021997485.

[24] McGlone F, Wessberg J, Olausson H. Discriminative and Affective Touch: Sensing and Feeling. Neuron 2014;82:737–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.05.001.

[25] Ellingsen D-M, Leknes S, Løseth G, Wessberg J, Olausson H. The Neurobiology Shaping Affective Touch: Expectation, Motivation, and Meaning in the Multisensory Context. Frontiers in Psychology 2016;6:1986. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01986.

[26] Rolls ET, O'Doherty J, Kringelbach ML, Francis S, Bowtell R, McGlone F. Representations of pleasant and painful touch in the human orbitofrontal and cingulate cortices. Cerebral Cortex 2003;13:308–317.

[27] Drewnowski A, Krahn DD, Demitrack MA, Nairn K, Gosnell BA. Naloxone, an opiate blocker, reduces the consumption of sweet high-fat foods in obese and lean female binge eaters. The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 1995;61:1206–12. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/61.6.1206.

[28] Yeomans MR, Gray RW. Effects of Naltrexone on Food Intake and Changes in Subjective Appetite During Eating: Evidence for Opioid Involvement in the Appetizer Effect. Physiology & Behavior 1997;62:15–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-9384(97)00101-7.

[29] Buchel C, Miedl S, Sprenger C. Hedonic processing in humans is mediated by an opioidergic mechanism in a mesocorticolimbic system. ELife 2018;7:e39648. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.39648.

[30] Chelnokova O, Laeng B, Eikemo M, Riegels J, Løseth G, Maurud H, et al. Rewards of beauty: the opioid system mediates social motivation in humans. Mol Psychiatry 2014;19:746–7. https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2014.1.

[31] Machin AJ, Dunbar RIM. The brain opioid theory of social attachment: a review of the evidence. Behaviour 2011;148:985–1025.

[32] Nummenmaa L, Tuominen L, Dunbar R, Hirvonen J, Manninen S, Arponen E, et al. Social touch modulates endogenous μ-opioid system activity in humans. NeuroImage 2016;138:242–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.05.063.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[33] Korb S, Götzendorfer SJ, Massaccesi C, Sezen P, Graf I, Willeit M, et al. Dopaminergic and opioidergic regulation during anticipation and consumption of social and nonsocial rewards. ELife n.d.;9:e55797. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.55797.

[34] Case LK, Čeko M, Gracely JL, Richards EA, Olausson H, Bushnell MC. Touch Perception Altered by Chronic Pain and by Opioid Blockade. ENeuro 2016;3. https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0138-15.2016.

[35] Boehme R, Hauser S, Gerling GJ, Heilig M, Olausson H. Distinction of self-produced touch and social touch at cortical and spinal cord levels. PNAS 2019;116:2290–9. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1816278116.

[36] Kreuder A-K, Scheele D, Wassermann L, Wollseifer M, Stoffel-Wagner B, Lee MR, et al. How the brain codes intimacy: The neurobiological substrates of romantic touch: The Neurobiological Substrates of Romantic Touch. Human Brain Mapping 2017;38:4525–34. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.23679.

[37] Scheele D, Kendrick KM, Khouri C, Kretzer E, Schläpfer TE, Stoffel-Wagner B, et al. An Oxytocin-Induced Facilitation of Neural and Emotional Responses to Social Touch Correlates Inversely with Autism Traits. Neuropsychopharmacol 2014;39:2078–85. https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2014.78.

[38] Zimmermann K, Kendrick KM, Scheele D, Dau W, Banger M, Maier W, et al. Altered striatal reward processing in abstinent dependent cannabis users: Social context matters. European Neuropsychopharmacology 2019;29:356–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2019.01.106.

[39] May A, Stewart J, Paulus M, Tapert S. The effect of age on neural processing of pleasant soft touch stimuli. Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience 2014;8:52. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00052.

[40] Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, Amorim P, Janavs J, Weiller E, et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. J Clin Psychiatry 1998;59:22–33.

[41] 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;151:1132–6. https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.151.8.1132.

[42] Wilhelm FH, Kochar AS, Roth WT, Gross JJ. Social anxiety and response to touch: incongruence between self-evaluative and physiological reactions. Biol Psychol 2001;58:181–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0301-0511(01)00113-2.

[43] DGPPN, BÄK, KBV, AWMF. S3-Leitlinie/Nationale VersorgungsLeitlinie Unipolare Depression - Langfassung, 2. Auflage. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Psychiatrie, Psychotherapie und

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Nervenheilkunde (DGPPN); Bundesärztekammer (BÄK); Kassenärztliche Bundesvereinigung (KBV); Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Wissenschaftlichen Medizinischen Fachgesellschaften (AWMF); 2015. https://doi.org/10.6101/AZQ/000364.

[44] Hamilton M. A Rating Scale for Depression. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1960;23:56–62.

[45] Beck AT, Steer RA, Ball R, Ranieri W. Comparison of Beck Depression Inventories -IA and -II in psychiatric outpatients. J Pers Assess 1996;67:588–97. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6703_13.

[46] Maier A, Gieling C, Heinen-Ludwig L, Stefan V, Schultz J, Güntürkün O, et al. Association of Childhood Maltreatment With Interpersonal Distance and Social Touch Preferences in Adulthood. AJP 2019:appi.ajp.2019.19020212. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.19020212.

[47] McGlone F, Olausson H, Boyle JA, Jones-Gotman M, Dancer C, Guest S, et al. Touching and feeling: differences in pleasant touch processing between glabrous and hairy skin in humans: Pleasant touch on glabrous and hairy skin. European Journal of Neuroscience 2012;35:1782–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2012.08092.x.

[48] Löken LS, Wessberg J, Morrison I, McGlone F, Olausson H. Coding of pleasant touch by unmyelinated afferents in humans. Nature Neuroscience 2009;12:547–8. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.2312.

[49] McFarquhar M. Modeling Group-Level Repeated Measurements of Neuroimaging Data Using the Univariate General Linear Model. Front Neurosci 2019;13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2019.00352.

[50] Rolls ET, Huang C-C, Lin C-P, Feng J, Joliot M. Automated anatomical labelling atlas 3. NeuroImage 2020;206:116189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116189.

[51] Gazzola V, Spezio ML, Etzel JA, Castelli F, Adolphs R, Keysers C. Primary somatosensory cortex discriminates affective significance in social touch. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2012;109:E1657–66. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1113211109.

[52] Sailer U, Hausmann M, Croy I. Pleasantness Only? Experimental Psychology 2020;67:224–36. https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169/a000492.

[53] Laurent HK, Ablow JC. A cry in the dark: depressed mothers show reduced neural activation to their own infant's cry. Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience 2012;7:125–34. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsq091.

[54] Elmer T, Stadtfeld C. Depressive symptoms are associated with social isolation in face-to-face interaction networks. Sci Rep 2020;10:1444. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-58297-9.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[55] Visentini C, Cassidy M, Bird VJ, Priebe S. Social networks of patients with chronic depression: A systematic review. Journal of Affective Disorders 2018;241:571–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.08.022.

[56] Achterbergh L, Pitman A, Birken M, Pearce E, Sno H, Johnson S. The experience of loneliness among young people with depression: a qualitative meta-synthesis of the literature. BMC Psychiatry 2020;20:415. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02818-3.

[57] Meltzer H, Bebbington P, Dennis MS, Jenkins R, McManus S, Brugha TS. Feelings of loneliness among adults with mental disorder. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol 2013;48:5–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-012-0515-8.

[58] Holvast F, Burger H, de Waal MMW, van Marwijk HWJ, Comijs HC, Verhaak PFM. Loneliness is associated with poor prognosis in late-life depression: Longitudinal analysis of the Netherlands study of depression in older persons. Journal of Affective Disorders 2015;185:1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2015.06.036.

[59] Wang J, Mann F, Lloyd-Evans B, Ma R, Johnson S. Associations between loneliness and perceived social support and outcomes of mental health problems: a systematic review. BMC Psychiatry 2018;18:156. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1736-5.

[60] Calati R, Ferrari C, Brittner M, Oasi O, Olié E, Carvalho AF, et al. Suicidal thoughts and behaviors and social isolation: A narrative review of the literature. Journal of Affective Disorders 2019;245:653–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2018.11.022.

[61] Kim BJ, Kihl T. Suicidal ideation associated with depression and social support: a survey-based analysis of older adults in South Korea. BMC Psychiatry 2021;21:409. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03423-8.

[62] Jakubiak BK, Feeney BC. Affectionate Touch to Promote Relational, Psychological, and Physical Well-Being in Adulthood: A Theoretical Model and Review of the Research. Pers Soc Psychol Rev 2017;21:228–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316650307.

[63] Bell RA, Daly JA, Gonzalez MC. Affinity-Maintenance in Marriage and Its Relationship to Women's Marital Satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family 1987;49:445. https://doi.org/10.2307/352313.

[64] Gulledge AK, Gulledge MH, Stahmannn RF. Romantic Physical Affection Types and Relationship Satisfaction. The American Journal of Family Therapy 2003;31:233–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/01926180390201936.

[65] Muise A, Giang E, Impett EA. Post Sex Affectionate Exchanges Promote Sexual and Relationship Satisfaction. Arch Sex Behav 2014;43:1391–402. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-014-0305-3.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[66] Law RW, Sbarra DA. The Effects of Church Attendance and Marital Status on the Longitudinal Trajectories of Depressed Mood Among Older Adults. J Aging Health 2009;21:803–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/0898264309338300.

[67] Woods A, Solomonov N, Liles B, Guillod A, Kales HC, Sirey JA. Perceived Social Support and Interpersonal Functioning as Predictors of Treatment Response Among Depressed Older Adults. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2021;29:843–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jagp.2020.12.021.

[68] Pechtel P, Dutra SJ, Goetz EL, Pizzagalli DA. Blunted reward responsiveness in remitted depression. Journal of Psychiatric Research 2013;47:1864–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2013.08.011.

[69] Weinberg A, Shankman SA. Blunted Reward Processing in Remitted Melancholic Depression. Clinical Psychological Science 2017;5:14–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702616633158.

[70] Dichter GS, Kozink RV, McClernon FJ, Smoski MJ. Remitted major depression is characterized by reward network hyperactivation during reward anticipation and hypoactivation during reward outcomes. Journal of Affective Disorders 2012;136:1126–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2011.09.048.

[71] Geugies H, Mocking RJT, Figueroa CA, Groot PFC, Marsman J-BC, Servaas MN, et al. Impaired reward-related learning signals in remitted unmedicated patients with recurrent depression. Brain 2019;142:2510–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awz167.

[72] McCabe C, Cowen PJ, Harmer CJ. Neural representation of reward in recovered depressed patients. Psychopharmacology 2009;205:667–77. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-009-1573-9.

[73] Conradi HJ, Ormel J, Jonge P de. Presence of individual (residual) symptoms during depressive episodes and periods of remission: a 3-year prospective study. Psychological Medicine 2011;41:1165–74. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291710001911.

[74] Schrader GD. Does anhedonia correlate with depression severity in chronic depression? Comprehensive Psychiatry 1997;38:260–3. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-440X(97)90057-2.

[75] Hopko DR, Lejuez CW, Ruggiero KJ, Eifert GH. Contemporary behavioral activation treatments for depression: Procedures, principles, and progress. Clinical Psychology Review 2003;23:699–717. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(03)00070-9.

[76] Luoto KE, Lindholm LH, Paavonen V, Koivukangas A, Lassila A, Leinonen E, et al. Behavioral activation versus treatment as usual in naturalistic sample of psychiatric patients with depressive symptoms: a benchmark controlled trial. BMC Psychiatry 2018;18:238. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1820-x.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[77] Dichter GS, Felder JN, Petty C, Bizzell J, Ernst M, Smoski MJ. The Effects of Psychotherapy on Neural Responses to Rewards in Major Depression. Biological Psychiatry 2009;66:886–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2009.06.021.

[78] Arnold MM, Müller-Oerlinghausen B, Hemrich N, Bönsch D. Effects of Psychoactive Massage in Outpatients with Depressive Disorders: A Randomized Controlled Mixed-Methods Study. Brain Sciences 2020;10:676. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci10100676.

[79] Röhricht F, Papadopoulos N, Priebe S. An exploratory randomized controlled trial of body psychotherapy for patients with chronic depression. Journal of Affective Disorders 2013;151:85–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.05.056.

[80] Fuchs T. Melancholia as a Desynchronization: Towards a Psychopathology of Interpersonal Time. PSP 2001;34:179–86. https://doi.org/10.1159/000049304.

[81] Fuchs T, Schlimme JE. Embodiment and psychopathology: a phenomenological perspective. Current Opinion in Psychiatry 2009;22:570–575. https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO.0b013e3283318e5c.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure legends

Fig. 1. Depression symptom severity as measured by Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS-17) scores decreased over the treatment course (**A**). Patients rated fast but not slow touch as significantly less comfortable than controls (**B**). At baseline patients reported a higher aversion to social touch than controls (**C**). Indicated *p*-values are Bonferroni corrected. Violin plots are kernel density plots comparable to histograms with infinitely small bin sizes. The ribbon and error bars indicate 95%-confidence intervals. Abbreviations: CTRL, controls; PAT, patients; VAS, visual analogue scale. *$p < .05$, ***$p < .001$.

Fig. 2. Patients exhibited decreased neural responses to social touch in the bilateral nucleus accumbens (**A**) and caudate nucleus (**B**) across time (i.e. before and after treatment) compared with healthy controls. Significant clusters are displayed at a peak-level threshold of $p < .05$ uncorrected. Parameter estimates are displayed for peak voxels. Error bars indicate 95%-confidence intervals. Abbreviations: CTRL, controls; PAT, patients. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Fig. 3. Treatment responders exhibited heightened neural responses to social touch in the right caudate nucleus across time compared with non-responders (**A**). Responses to slow touch in the left anterior insula were increased in responders across time compared with non-responders (**B**). Significant clusters are displayed at a peak-level threshold of $p < .05$ uncorrected. Parameter estimates are displayed for peak voxels. Indicated *p*-values are Bonferroni corrected. Error bars indicate 95%-confidence intervals. Abbreviations: NR, non-responders; R, responders. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.


A
***
***
***
20
15
10
5
HDRS−17 Score
Week
0
1
2
3
B
Slow
Fast
*
100
75
50
25
0
Touch Comfort (VAS)
PAT
CTRL
PAT
CTRL
C
***
75
50
25
0
Social Touch Aversion
PAT
CTRL


A
Nucleus Accumbens
Main Effect of Group (Touch > No Touch)
L
R
y = 14
z = - 4
0
4
8
12
F-score
Left
(−6, 16, −4)
Right
(4, 14, −2)
Parameter Estimates
**
*
PAT
CTRL
PAT
CTRL
B
Caudate Nucleus
Main Effect of Group (Touch > No Touch)
L
R
y = 14
z = 10
0
4
8
12
F-score
Left
(−14, 20, 12)
Right
(10, 10, 14)
Parameter Estimates
**
**
PAT
CTRL
PAT
CTRL


A
Caudate Nucleus Right
Main Effect of Response (Touch > No Touch)
L
R
y = 12
z = 12
0
4
8
12
F-score
Parameter Estimates
(22, 20, 12)
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.0
*
R
NR
B
Anterior Insula Left
Interaction Speed by Response (Touch > No Touch)
y = 28
L
R
z = 5
0
4
8
12
F-score
Slow
Fast
Parameter Estimates
(−26, 26, 2)
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.0
**
**
R
NR
R
NR

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.25.21266854; this version posted December 17, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Demographic and clinical data for patients and controls

	Patients (n = 53)	Controls (n = 41)	*p*-value
Sex (male/female)	26/27	19/22	0.837
Age (in years)	41.58 (13.09)	40.61 (13.22)	0.722
Education (in years)	15.89 (5.42)	17.16 (3.76)	0.203
Handedness (left/right)	4/49	3/38	1.000
Duration current depressive episode (in years)	4.66 (5.52)		
Number of depressive episodes	3.15 (2.83) (n = 47)		
HDRS-17			
Baseline	17.26 (5.63)	0.23 (0.58)	< 0.001
After treatment	10.21 (5.78)		< 0.001
Improvement (in percent)	40.40 (28.67)		
Response (yes/no)	23/30		
BDI-II			
Baseline	33.34 (8.75)	2.76 (3.27)	< 0.001
After treatment	19.28 (10.80)		< 0.001
Improvement (in percent)	41.70 (28.25)		
4 weeks after treatment[a]	22.28 (11.59) (n = 50)		< 0.001
8 weeks after treatment[a]	23.73 (10.80) (n = 49)		< 0.001
12 weeks after treatment[a]	24.37 (9.97) (n = 46)		< 0.001
CTQ	45.08 (16.26)	29.68 (4.6)	< 0.001

Values are given as frequencies or as means (SD). The *p*-values report the significance levels reached for independent *t*-tests or Fisher's exact tests comparing groups or for paired *t*-tests comparing improvement within patients. [a] BDI-II Follow-up measurements are compared to baseline scores. The significance threshold was set at $p < .05$. Abbreviations: BDI-II, Beck Depression Inventory; HDRS, 17-item Hamilton Depression Rating Scale.