medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



# The motivational control of human action, its neural bases and functional impact in OCD.

Iain E. Perkes[1,2,3], Richard W. Morris[4,5], Kristi R. Griffiths[6], Stephanie Quail[1], Felicity Waters[7], Margot O'Brien[7], Philip L. Hazell,[7,8] & Bernard W. Balleine[1*]

1. Decision Neuroscience Lab, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia.
2. Discipline of Psychiatry & Mental Health and Discipline of Paediatrics & Children's Health, School of Clinical Medicine, UNSW Medicine & Health, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia.
3. Department of Psychological Medicine, Sydney Children's Hospital Network, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia.
4. Brain and Mind Centre, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2050, Australia.
5. School of Psychology, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2050, Australia
6. Brain Dynamics Centre, The Westmead Institute for Medical Research, The University of Sydney, Westmead, NSW 2145, Australia.
7. Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services, Sydney Local Health District, Sydney, NSW 2050, Australia.
8. Specialty of Psychiatry, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2050, Australia.

*Corresponding author

**Running title:** Motivational control of human action

**Correspondence:**

Bernard Balleine
Decision Neuroscience Lab
School of Psychology, UNSW Sydney
Randwick, NSW 2052
Australia

bernard.balleine@unsw.edu.au
+61 435 659 949

Word count: **4306**

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**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/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



## Abstract

Establishing the motivational influences on human behaviour is essential for understanding choice and decision-making in health and disease. Here we used tests of value-based decision-making that manipulated both predicted and experienced reward values to reveal the role these processes play in human action selection, their neural bases and functional significance in people with OCD. We found clear evidence that both predicted and experienced values influence choice and decision-making in humans and for a circuit involving orbitofrontal cortex (OFC) and caudate nucleus in these aspects of action control. To establish the functional significance of this circuit in value-based processes we assessed their influence in healthy participants and a matched cohort of people diagnosed with obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD). We found that choice between actions in people with OCD was insensitive to changes in either predicted or experienced values and that these behavioural impairments corresponded to aberrant activity in the OFC, the caudate nucleus and their connectivity.

**Keywords:** obsessive-compulsive disorder; Pavlovian-instrumental transfer; outcome devaluation; orbitofrontal cortex; caudate nucleus; adolescents

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



The capacity for goal-directed action allows us and other animals to influence the environment in the service of our basic needs and desires[1,2]. Such actions constitute, therefore, an adaptive and flexible form of behavioural control that depends on encoding the relationship between an action and its consequences, or outcome, during learning and on the value of the outcome for performance[3]. Despite the functional significance of this capacity, the processes that generate the outcome values determining human action remain unclear[4,5]. In contrast, considerable evidence from rodents suggests that value-based control involves two forms of incentive learning; one generated by stimuli that predict reward—predicted values—and a second by direct experience of the emotional response evoked by an outcome—experienced values[6,7]. Such values influence instrumental performance in humans[8,9], and the broader circuitry is conserved across species[10], however the integration of these values during performance and the neural substrates that support that integrative process are underexplored. Furthermore, there is only limited evidence that the neural substrates of these value-based processes play a causal role in action control in humans[11,12]. We sought, therefore, to examine these aspects of human goal-directed action.

To examine these sources of motivational control, we developed behavioural tests that probe the influence of predicted and experienced values on human action[13–15]. These forms of incentive learning have distinct psychological and behavioural determinants[16,17]. However, recent evidence from rodents suggests that their influence on performance involves a final common pathway[18] including the medial orbitofrontal cortex (mOFC)[19] and its projections to the striatum[20]. In evaluating the neural bases of these incentive processes, therefore, we focused on this orbito-striatal circuit. Importantly, converging evidence from people with various psychiatric conditions suggests that aberrant orbitofrontal activity is associated with a range of symptoms, particularly those observed in obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD)[15,21–23]. We sought, therefore, to establish the functional significance of these incentive processes for human action by comparing the performance of healthy participants to a matched cohort diagnosed with OCD. If the OFC is critical to the motivational control of goal-directed action, then activity and connectivity in the orbital-striatal circuit should relate to performance in healthy people whereas abnormal activity and connectivity should be predicted to attenuate value-based control of goal-directed action in people with OCD.

## Results

Participants with OCD were a representative sample; the mean Children's Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale (CY-BOCS) score was moderate, psychotropic medications were used by 70%, and 75% had a comorbid (lifetime) psychiatric diagnosis. People with OCD had greater symptoms of depression, anxiety and stress, however no individual scored higher than moderate. There were no significant group differences in age, gender, handedness, education, intelligence, hunger or food reward preference ratings (all *ts* < 1; see **Table 1**).

The battery of learning and performance tasks for human participants used here was based on tests developed and validated in rodents (**Figure 1A**)[2,13]. Here, we gamified these tasks using a virtual vending machine, examining performance in two groups of adolescents — one group in good health (Group HA) and the other group diagnosed with OCD (**Table 1; see** and Methods for details). Participants were trained to expect the delivery of food outcomes based on instrumental actions and predictive stimuli. We then assessed the effect of varying predicted and experienced outcome values during choice tests conducted while participants underwent an MRI scan followed by diffusion imaging.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



**Table 1.** Demographic and clinical characteristics

| | *OCD (n = 20)* | *Controls (n = 21)* | *t or $x^2$ (df = 38)* | *p-value* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 15 (2) | 15 (2) | 0.48 | 0.63 |
| Right handed (total) | 17 | 21 | 3.40 | 0.07 |
| Females (total) | 8 | 8 | 0.02 | 0.90 |
| English second language (total) | 2 | 5 | 1.73 | 0.19 |
| Years of education | 10 (2) | 11 (1) | 0.66 | 0.51 |
| Intelligence: WRAT | 48 (6) | 49 (5) | 0.56 | 0.58 |
| Symptom dimensions: DASS-21 | | | | |
| Depression | 7 (6) | 3 (4) | 2.53 | 0.02 |
| Anxiety | 7 (4) | 3 (3) | 2.98 | 0.01 |
| Stress | 12 (9) | 5 (4) | 2.92 | 0.01 |
| OCD diagnosis | 20 | 0 | | |
| OCD symptoms: CY-BOCS | | | | |
| Obsessions | 9 (5) | 0 | | |
| Compulsions | 8 (4) | 0 | | |
| Total | 17 (9) | 0 | | |
| Lifetime comorbid psychiatric diagnoses | 15 (75%) | 3 (14%) | | |
| anxiety disorder | 3 (15%) | 0 | | |
| depressive disorder | 9 (45%) | 0 | | |
| adjustment disorder | 2 (10%) | 2* | | |
| tic disorder | 4 (20%) | 0 | | |
| attention deficit hyperactivity disorder | 3 (15%) | 0 | | |
| substance use disorder | 2 (10%) | 0 | | |
| post-traumatic stress disorder | 1 (5%) | 0 | | |
| oppositional defiance disorder | 2 (10%) | 0 | | |
| eating disorder | 1 (5%) | 0 | | |
| elimination disorder | 1 (5%) | 1** | | |
| Current psychotropic medications | 14 (70% | 0 | | |
| SSRI monotherapy | 5 (25%) | 0 | | |
| SSRI and anti-psychotic | 6 (30%) | 0 | | |
| other | 3 (15%) | 0 | | |

Notes: Means (SD or percentages) or totals of each demographic variable, along with symptom severity scores. Obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) Childrens Yale Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale (CYBOCS [score of 18 = moderate severity]), selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI), Weschler Ranging Assessment Test (WRAT), Depression Anxiety Stres Scale 21-item version (DASS-21 [all means for cases in the moderate range; all means for controls in the normal range]), Children's Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale (CY-BOCS). *Adustment disorder with depressed mood in full sustained remission. **Encopresis, in remission. None of the control group had a current psychiatric disorder.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



***People with or without OCD learned and remembered the predicted and experienced values***

During *instrumental conditioning* (**Figure 1A**) participants learned to dislodge specific snacks by tilting the virtual vending machine left (A1) or right (A2). Each action was associated with the delivery of different outcome (i.e., A1-O1 and A2-O2). There were no significant group differences in the amount of food earned during instrumental conditioning, the quantity (±SEM) of outcomes earned was 18.5 (0.6) and 18.7 (0.6) for HA and OCD groups respectively ($t < 1$; **Table 2**). We then associated, by *Pavlovian conditioning* (**Figure 1B**), four different predictive stimuli (S1-S4)—coloured lights on the vending machine—with four different, outcomes (O1-O4). The same two outcomes (O1, O2) from instrumental conditioning were again used—S1 was associated with O1 (S1-O1), S2 with O2 (S2-O2). We introduced a third, novel, food reward outcome (O3) and associated it with S3 (S3-O3). Finally, we associated the explicit absence of food reward outcome with S4 (S4-Ø). Participants registered six consecutive correct answers to complete the Pavlovian and instrumental conditioning stages respectively. Healthy adolescents and those with OCD maintained declarative recall of these associations after the choice tests and MRI scans, the mean group percentage correct was 98 and 93 percent, respectively ($p$=.40) (**Table 2**). Groups also did not have an action selection bias and showed a similar relationship between response rate and rating for preferred reward (Pearson r for cases and controls was 0.33 and 0.38, respectively) (**Table 2**).

***Predicted values influenced choice in healthy people but not those with OCD***

To assess the influence of predicted value we used the Pavlovian-instrumental transfer (PIT) paradigm, including tests of outcome-specific PIT and general PIT to assess the ability of predictive stimuli to both motivate specific actions and to generate general motivational arousal (**Figure 1C**)[24,25]. Again, participants could tilt the vending machine left (A1) or right (A2) as during instrumental conditioning; however, to test the effect of predicted values, the coloured lights (S1-S4) from Pavlovian conditioning were presented on the front of the vending machine in random order separated by an active baseline period during which no coloured lights were presented. To isolate the effects of the stimuli, outcomes were neither displayed nor available for consumption during this test.

Stimuli had different effects depending on the outcome they predicted (**Figure 2A**). We tested whether participants could use outcome-specific predicted values, generated by stimuli S1 and S2, to direct choice toward actions associated with the 'same' outcomes as those predicted by the stimuli compared to actions associated with the outcome 'different' from that predicted (i.e., outcome-specific PIT). Action rate was comparable between participant groups during the pre-stimulus (baseline) period where the vending machine could be tipped ($t_{37} < 1$). However, in adolescents in good health, the specific stimuli (S1 and S2) elicited an immediate and potent elevation in the performance of the action that, during instrumental conditioning, resulted in the same outcome as that predicted by the stimuli, and a concomitant reduction in the performance of the 'different' action (A2) during the stimuli. In contrast, the effect of predicted outcome values on choice was markedly impaired in adolescents with OCD who showed a mild but undifferentiated, that is general, increase above baseline for both the 'same' and 'different' actions during the specific stimuli (S1, S2), which is clear evidence of significantly impaired specific transfer in OCD (planned group by action interaction $F_{1,37}$=6.26, $p$ =.017, $\eta_p^2$=.15).

We also tested the general arousing effect of predictive stimuli (i.e., General PIT[25]) by

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.






**Figure 1.** Pavlovian-instrumental transfer.

Tilting the vending machine to the left or the right (actions) earned food reward outcomes (1s) during instrumental training. No actions were available during Pavlovian training and lights appeared on the vending machine to predict food delivery. Vending machine could be tilted and lights (e.g., red light) appeared on the machine presented during the transfer test. All outcomes were 1s. All stimuli were 6s. All inter-trial-intervals (ITI) were 5-15s.

**Table 2.** Conditioning results

| | *OCD (n=20)* | *Controls (n=21)* | *t or $X^2$ (df=38)* | *p-value* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-training | | | | |
| hunger | 6.2 | 5.9 (0.3) | 0.14 | 0.56 |
| food preference range | 0.25 | 0.17 | | |
| Instrumental training | | | | |
| correlation, preferance-action | 0.33 | 0.38 | | |
| snacks won, n (SEM) | 18.5 (0.6) | 18.7 (0.6) | < 1 | |
| Pavlovian training | | | | |
| correct answers % (SEM) | 91% (4) | 98% (3) | t37 = 1.79 | 0.09 |
| Post-test | | | | |
| hunger | 5.9 (0.3) | 5.5 (0.4) | < 1 | |
| associative learning recall | 93 | 98 | | 0.4 |

Notes: SEM = standard error of the mean; OCD = obsessive compulsive disorder; n = number; commercial names of food rewards: Arnott's Chocolate Tiny Teddy® Biscuits 250g, Doritos® Cheese Supreme Corn Chips 114g, Cheezels® Cheese Snacks 114g, Arnott's BBQ Shapes® 250g, Milk Chocolate M&M'S® 49g.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



comparing responding during the generally rewarding (S3) and null (S4) predictors. Importantly, the general value prediction induced by S3 increased the performance of both actions (A1 and A2) relative to the null value prediction of S4 (**Figure 2B**) and, unlike the specific value predictions in the specific PIT test, this effect did not appear to differ between participant groups. The planned group-by-stimulus interaction conducted on action rates during the S3 and S4 stimuli was not significant ($p$=.47). There was, however, a significant main effect of stimulus ($F_{1,37}$=7.22, $p$ =.01, $\eta_p^2$=.17). That is, in people with OCD the influence of specific predicted values on choice was impaired whereas the general arousing effect of predictive stimuli on overall levels of performance was spared.

***The influence of predicted values on choice was associated with orbitofrontal activation***

BOLD activity parametrically modulated by the rate of specific transfer during each trial of S1 and S2 (i.e., the rate on the 'same' minus 'different' action) was revealed by the planned SPM t-test of healthy adolescents: the global peak voxels occurred in the bilateral OFC (right OFC MNI: 36,34,-18; t=7.35, k=122, FDR=.025; left OFC MNI: -22,44-20; t=6.05, k=14, FDR=.026), left dorsal caudate (MNI: -18,4,24; t=6.41, k=20, FDR=.026), right putamen (MNI: 18,16,-2; t=6.14, k=20; FDR=.026), superior frontal gyrus (BA9, MNI: 8,56,34; $t$=5.84, k=12, FDR=.032) and the parietal cortex (MNI: -46,-30,36; t=7.26, k=138, FDR=.025)**(Figure 2C)**. A orbito-striatal-parietal network was therefore actively modulated by predicted value in healthy adolescents suggesting this network plays a role in representing the outcome-specific incentive values generated by predictive stimuli to guide choice.

***Orbitofrontal activity predicts OCD and compulsion severity***

In contrast, adolescents with OCD showed hyperactive neural responses associated with outcome-specific predictions compared with healthy adolescents in the planned whole-brain SPM t-test (**Figure 2D**). The greatest hyperactivity occurred in the rostromedial OFC (MNI: -6,46,-24; $F_{2,37}$=31.54, k=582, FDR < .001). Importantly, hyperactivity was also observed in the right lateral OFC (MNI: 44,32,-8; $F_{2,37}$=29.69, k=516, FDR=.001) and the left lateral OFC (MNI: -40,42,-12; $F_{2,37}$=18.47, k=201, FDR=.002). Examination of the BOLD parameter estimates for each group confirmed that these differences were due to larger BOLD estimates in adolescents with OCD rather than negative BOLD estimates in those without (**Figure 2D inset**). No between-group differences in activity in the caudate or cingulate cortex were found; however there were significant differences in the left and right middle temporal gyri (e.g., MNI: -58,-26,-18; $F$=22.95, k=693, FDR=.001).

Compulsion symptoms were related to the largest hyperactive BOLD response in the rostromedial OFC in the OCD adolescents in an ROI analysis (**Figure 2E**). The ROI analysis included obsession and compulsion severity as SPM covariates-of-interest and revealed a significant positive correlation between compulsion severity and hyperactive BOLD responses (MNI: 4,44,-2; t=4.39, FWE=.016, svc). This suggests the mOFC may act as a nexus linking the influence of predicted values during specific PIT to compulsions during choice.

An analysis including age or WRAT score as a covariate did not change the pattern of results between groups (e.g., largest group difference in rostral OFC: -4,50,-20, $F_{2,36}$=32.30, FDR < .001 after controlling for age). Likewise, excluding three left-handed OCD participants did not alter the pattern of significant results between groups (e.g., largest group difference MNI: -6,46,-24, $F_{2,34}$=32.47, FDR < .001). An analysis limited to the OCD group and including antidepressant dose (fluoxetine equivalent dose) as a covariate did not reveal any significant effects of medication (FDR=.873).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.






**Figure 2**. Pavlovian-instrumental transfer test results.

A) Mean (±SEM) action rates (per second) before and during the specific stimuli for the same food reward, or a different food reward. Post-hoc t-tests confirmed the action rate for the same food reward was significantly greater than the other action in HA ($p < .01$). B) Mean (±SEM) response rates (per second) before and during the S3 stimuli for the novel food reward, and the S4 stimuli for the null reward. Post hoc t-tests confirmed the response rate during S3 was significantly greater than S4, $p < .05$. C) Hyperactive BOLD responses in the lateral and medial OFC among OCD tracking outcome-specific incentive value. D) BOLD responses in the mOFC (ROI) tracking general incentive value among OCD and HA. E) Significant correlation between compulsion severity and hyperactive BOLD responses in the medial OFC of OCD. F-H) raw tractography thresholded at the top 0.02% of efferent and afferent tracts from rostromedial OFC, left lateral OFC, and right lateral OFC across all participants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



***Stronger orbitofrontal tracts predicted a weaker influence of predicted value on choice.***
The tractography analysis supported the cortical network implicated in the influence of predicted value, using the largest between-group differences in the fMRI results as seed regions. **Figures 2F & 2G** show the raw tractography thresholded at the top 0.02% of efferent and afferent tracts from rostromedial OFC, left lateral OFC, and right lateral OFC across all participants. There were no between-group differences in tract strength with any of the seed regions tested and so we collapsed across participant groups and determined tracts correlated with the average rate of specific transfer calculated per participant. There was a significant negative correlation with the average rate of specific transfer and the tract strength between the left lateral OFC and the middle frontal gyrus (**Figure 2F**, peak voxel -28 10 24, pFWE=.047, cluster size 286 voxels). In other words, across both groups, the stronger the OFC–MFG tract connection the weaker the influence of predicted values on choice during outcome-specific PIT.

***mOFC conducts general value predictions in adolescnts with or without OCD***
There were no significant differences between groups in action rate during the general reward stimulus (S3) and the null reward stimulus (S4) so we collapsed this measure across groups and examined the effect of incentive motivation on neural activity in an ROI of the mOFC [13]). Rostromedial OFC activity tracked changes in incentive motivation across presentations of the general predictive stimulus (S3) and S4 in both groups (**Figure 2H**, MNI: 12,38,-6; $t_{38}$=4.77, k=78, FWE=.002, svc), indicating that the influence of stimulus-driven general reward arousal on brain activity in adolescents in good health was intact in adolescents with OCD. There were no significant BOLD differences between groups in this ROI (FWE = .19), indicating that, on average, general incentive processes in the (rostro) mOFC were also intact.

***Pavlovian-instrumental transfer (post-test memory)***
To investigate whether the degree of associative learning influenced transfer a post-hoc analysis of participants who remembered all Pavlovian and instrumental contingencies at the end of the experiments replicated the group differences in PIT. We excluded participants with a post-test memory score less than 100 percent (2 controls and 5 OCD) leaving OCD *n*=14 and controls *n*=18 in each group for this analysis. The mean response rates among these subgroups of 'complete learners' confirmed the marked deficit in predictive value during specific transfer remained in the OCD relative to the control group (**Figure 2A inset**, group interaction $F_{1,30}$=5.23, *p*=.029, $\eta_p^2$=.15), alongside intact stimuli-elicited motivation during general transfer (**Figure 2B inset**, main effect of cue $F_{1,30}$ =9.93, *p*=.004, $\eta_p^2$=.25; group interaction $F < 1$). To investigate whether the lack of action selection bias in the OCD group was due to a symmetry symptom domain, a subgroup of OCD participants with symmetry compulsions or obsessions (n=8) was compared to those without (n=11). The 2 (subgroup) x 2 (choice) mixed ANOVA on response rates revealed no significant main effects or interactions (*F*s < 1).

***The influence of experienced value on choice in health and OCD.***
Next, we manipulated experienced value to test its influence on choice in an outcome devaluation assessment. To induce devaluation, participants watched a short video showing cockroach infestation of one of the two outcomes (O1 or O2) used in instrumental conditioning, then completed a choice test on the vending machine in nominal extinction, that is, no coloured lights were shown and no snacks seen or consumed (Methods) (**Figure 3**).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.






**Figure 3**. Outcome devaluation

After watching the infestation of the (now devalued) food reward, the vending machine could be tilted to the left or right but no outcomes were delivered.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



After viewing the outcome revaluation video, healthy adolescents preferred the action associated with the uncontaminated—still valued—outcome. In contrast, people with OCD showed behavioural perseveration after outcome revaluation and persisted in performing the devalued action (**Figure 4A**). The 3-way ANOVA (group-action choice-trial) confirmed the interaction between group and choice was significant after revaluation ($F_{1,185}$=8.028, $p$=.005, $\eta_p^2$=.04), due to the larger difference between response rates on the devalued and still-valued action between participant groups (**Figure 4A inset**). To satisfy fMRI protocols the outcome revaluation test was 15 min duration and there was a main effect of trial as responding decreased across the test ($F_{4,148}$ = 3.454, $p$<.001, $\eta_p^2$=.085) but no group x action x trial interaction ($F_{4,185}$ = 0.109, $p$=.979, $\eta_p^2$=.002).

We assessed the effect of the outcome devaluation procedure on experienced value by calculating the change in food desirability ratings before and after the experiment. There were no inter-group differences in the change in outcome desirabilty (post – pre) for the food outcomes, shown in **Figure 4B**. The planned two-way ANOVA revealed a significant main effect of revaluation on food desire rating changes ($F_{1,39}$ =24.388, $p$ < .001, $\eta_p^2$=.397) but neither the main effect of group nor the interaction were significant (interaction $F_{1,39}$=0.015, $p$=.903, , $\eta_p^2$ < .001). Hence, the change in experienced value induced by the cockroach video was comparable between participant groups. Despite the difference in choice performance, the correlation between desire rating change and action rate relative to the devalued outcome was significant in both groups ($r$=.604 and .628, $p$s < .05 for OCD and HA groups respectively). A linear regression confirmed that there was no significant difference in slope between groups ($p$=.96). As such, although the influence of experienced value on choice after outcome devaluation clearly differed between groups, this appeared not to be due to any difference in sensitivity to the devaluation treatment *per se*. Rather, the behavioural insensitivity in people with OCD indicated an impaired capacity to integrate a change in experienced value with action-outcome knowledge to modify choice. In other words, people with OCD experienced the change in outcome value normally but had difficulty translating this into action.

The majority of the OCD group had obsessions with contamination or disgust obsessions ($n$=16; 80%). The effect of revaluation in this subgroup was significant ($p$=.007, Cohen's $d$=0.77, corrected for dependence between means) and the effect size was similar or larger than that among the total OCD group (i.e., Cohen's $d$=0.52, corrected). However, the correlation between symptom severity and choices or ratings after revaluation in this subgroup were small and non-significant ($r$s < .361).

***Dorsal caudate and mOFC activity tracked the effect of experienced values on choice***

BOLD activity tracking choices driven by experienced value were determined by the planned SPM t-test in healthy adolescents: significant effects occurred in the dorsal caudate (MNI: -14,6,18; $t_{19}$ = 17.75, FDR < .001), rostrolateral prefrontal cortex (BA10, MNI: -22,60,2; $t_{19}$ = 16.44, FDR < .001), ventral anterior cingulate (BA24, MNI: -18,30,-2; $t_{19}$ = 14.76, FDR < .001) and the mOFC (MNI: 14,54,-2; $t_{19}$ = 13.19, FDR < .001) shown in **Figure 4C**.

Group differences were detected within an ROI analysis of the mOFC cluster found above (i.e., (MNI: 14,54,-2), and revealed a significant deficit in activity in the anterior cingulate of the adolescents with OCD (**Figure 4D**, MNI: 2,50,10; $F_{2,39}$ = 10.64, k = 29, FWE = .028, svc). Parameter estimates from the peak voxel in the ROI were extracted per participant and correlated with the difference score per participant (average rate of still-valued actions

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.






**Figure 4**. Devaluation test results.

A) Mean (±SEM) action rates (per second) for valued and devalued food rewards, during each minute of the devaluation test. B) Mean (±SEM) food rating change of the devalued (empty bar) and still-valued food (filled bar) after devaluation (pre – post). C) BOLD activity tracked valued actions in the dorsal caudate and mOFC of HA. D) Hypoactive BOLD responses in the mOFC (ROI) tracked valued actions of OCD. E) lower vmPFC – head of caudate (peak MNI coordinates: 6, 18, -6, cluster size: 56 voxels) tract strength in adolescents with OCD relative to healthy controls. F) average connectivity, across all participants, of the vmPFC seed mask (top 0.02% of tracts sent from this seed mask).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



minus average rate of devalued actions). The correlation between vmPFC BOLD activity and the difference score was $r$=–.51 and +.17 in people with and without OCD respectively (p=.046) (**Figure 4D inset**), suggesting that, in adolescents with OCD, vmPFC activity was inhibiting rather than driving goal-directed choice. Analysis including age or WRAT score as a covariate did not change the significant group difference in the vmPFC: MNI: 2,50,10, $F_{2,38}$ = 9.04, FWE = .035, svc, after controlling for age whereas $F_{2,38}$=9.82, FWE=.024, svc, after controlling for WRAT. And likewise, excluding three left-handed OCD participants did not alter the significant result (MNI: 2,50,10, $F_{2,36}$=8.75, FWE=.044, svc). A further analysis limited to the OCD group and including antidepressant dose (fluoxetine equivalent dose) as a covariate did not reveal any significant effects of medication (FDR=.279).

***vmPFC-caudate tract strength is weaker in adolescents with OCD.*** Using the vmPFC region identified above as a seed region, the tractography analysis compared tracts efferent and afferent to the vmPFC between groups to investigate neural disconnection as a contributing factor to task performance. This analysis revealed a lower vmPFC – head of caudate (peak MNI coordinates: 6, 18, -6, cluster size: 56 voxels) tract strength in adolescents with OCD relative to healthy controls ($p_{FWE}$=.008; **Figure 4E**). **Figure 4F** shows the average connectivity, across all participants, of the vmPFC seed mask (top 0.02% of tracts sent from this seed mask).

## Discussion

Prior research assessing the influence of motivation on goal-directed action in species other than humans, largely rodents, has established that two forms of incentive process are engaged: *predictive values*, derived from Pavlovian incentive learning, through which stimuli that predict reward can both select and enhance the performance of actions earning the rewards predicted by those stimuli; and *experienced values*, derived from an instrumental incentive learning process and generated by the emotional response experienced on contact with the goal of goal-directed actions[7,25]. Using tasks modelled on those used in rodents, the current study revealed that these same forms of incentive process exert comparable control over human action. Furthermore, although predicted and experienced values are derived from distinct neural circuits, in rodents their influence over instrumental performance involves a final common path involving a connection between the mOFC and the basal ganglia, notably the dorsomedial striatum[19,26]. Here we established that a homologous neural circuit involving the mOFC projection to the caudate nucleus is involved in the motivational control of human action. Furthermore, we revealed the functional significance of these capacities and their neural underpinnings by comparing healthy people with performance in those diagnosed with OCD. The latter showed striking deficits in the motivational control of goal-directed action and in the activity of the OFC-caudate circuit on which the influence of predicted and experienced values on choice depends.

Examining the outcome-specific and general transfer findings in more detail, it was clear that control by the specific and general predictions were driven by dissociable sources. Earlier research suggests outcome specific predictions are derived from the value of information, such as that conveyed by model-based control wherein Pavlovian stimuli provide information predicting forthcoming states[27]. In contrast, the influence of general predictions reflects a form of incentive motivation revealed in the general energising effects of stimuli rather than more specific effects on action selection. This distinction carries through to the neural level. Converging with rodent literature[24], we found that performance of the action

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



earning the same outcome as that predicted by the stimulus activated the lateral OFC, dorsal caudate, right putamen, superior frontal gyrus, and parietal cortex. The lateral OFC has been argued to reflect the discrimination of the specific outcome predicted by Pavlovian stimuli—lesion studies in rodents do not abolish transfer but do abolish its specificity[28–30]. Striatal, specifically posterior putamen, involvement has been reported in humans previously[31]. In rodents the circuit engages accumbens shell and projections to ventral pallidum and it is possible that the right putamen activation reflects homologous activity in humans[32,33]. However, the activity in dorsal caudate, superior frontal gyrus and parietal cortex suggests that an alternative dorsal circuit is also engaged that allows specific predicted values to guide action selection more selectively. In contrast, the primary influence of the general incentive motivational effects, that is, S3 vs. S4, was on activity in the mOFC adjacent to the nucleus accumbens core, a region implicated in general transfer in rodents[34,35]. Hence, whereas specific values influenced choice via a circuit focussed on the dorsal striatum, more general incentive effects influenced performance via the arousal-related effects of ventral striatal activity.

The distinction between the effects of OCD on specific and general transfer is critical to understanding these effects. The general arousing influence of stimuli was preserved in adolescents with OCD; however, there was near complete abolition of the behavioural influence of outcome-specific predictions. During actions driven by specific stimuli, increased activity was observed in the lateral OFC both in people with OCD and healthy controls. In adolescents with OCD, hyperactivity—related to compulsion severity—was also observed in rostro-medial OFC, suggesting that this increase was related to profound difficulty using predicted values to guide choice. Previous research has linked mOFC with the retrieval of specific action-outcome associations and a deficit in this retrieval would necessarily reduce the influence of specific outcome predictions on choice[36]. Indeed, sometime ago Modell et al developed a circuitry model of OCD with striking similarities to that involved in Pavlovian-instrumental transfer[37]. They argued that OCD pathology reflects dysregulation of a limbic-striatal-thalamic circuit that ultimately serves to modulate activity in the mOFC resulting, specifically, in OCD symptoms, a view that resonates with the current findings.

In contrast, the influence of experienced values on choice has previously been found to involve structures in medial PFC, mOFC and their projections to the dorsomedial striatum[10]. Importantly, a similar circuit appears to have been engaged in the current study in human participants involving the ventral anterior cingulate and mOFC connections with the caudate nucleus. In addition, and as we have previously reported in assessing the calculation of action values[38], we found evidence of dorsolateral PFC involvement. Interestingly, in people with OCD, and opposing the effects of predicted values, activity particularly in the mPFC decreased as their ability to use experienced reward decreased, a change that was related to connectivity with caudate nucleus; people with OCD showed reduced mOFC-caudate tract strength compared to those without OCD[22].

These findings resonate with evidence that middle-aged people with OCD show impaired goal-directed behaviour; particularly their ability to report the contingency between action and outcome[39,40]. Here we investigated adolescents to advance developmental knowledge and the causal role of OCD pathophysiology in this context. OCD begins during childhood or adolescence in 80% of people[41] and in that group has greater genetic contribution (45–65%) than adult-onset disorder (27–47%)[42]. Moreover, premorbid ritualised behaviour in early childhood occurs in probands and strong reactions to everyday sensory events is associated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



with high childhood ritualism[43,44]. These repetitive behaviours may be early manifestations of impaired goal-directed or volitional control and represent a behavioural marker that, if combined with a family history of illness, could predict disease onset and indicate early intervention. This is particularly important given that clinically developed behavioural tests in humans often do not show cognitive impairment in children with OCD[45], something that calls into question whether these impairments are a consequence of the illness or its social and experiential sequelae.

Understanding changes in volitional action associated with brain dysfunction may help to unlock the nature of disorders of human behaviour, particularly how such changes give rise to the symptoms OCD and other psychiatric conditions. It is worth noting in the current context that comorbidities are an unlikely source of the group differences in the current study. Apart from depressive disorders, mostly in remission, no additional diagnosis was present in more than 20% of the OCD group. And, importantly, despite heterogeneous comorbidities, there was limited variance in value-based performance in the clinical group. Whether the neural changes in OCD block, or occlude, the influence of such values is a matter for future studies. Nevertheless, it is clear that the influence of the OFC-caudate circuit on the sources of motivational control investigated here was not identical. The finding that OFC activity was increased during the outcome-specific PIT test suggests associated circuits may be continually in a state of heightened activity in OCD, which would be expected essentially to occlude further changes induced by predictive events. In contrast the finding that the mOFC circuit was hypoactive after changes in experienced value suggests that a deficit in the retrieval of the consequences of specific actions may lie at the heart of both the failure of such values to modulate choice between different courses of action and the compulsions characteristic of those with OCD.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



# Methods

## Design

We conducted a case-control cross-sectional study using associative learning paradigms, gold-standard clinical phenotyping, and multimodal magnetic resonance imaging. This study had approval (number 2012/2284) from The University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee.

## Participants

21 healthy adolescents (control group) and 20 adolescents with a lifetime DSM-5 diagnosis of OCD (OCD group) were included in analysis. The sample size was based on a similar study.[36] There were no group demographic differences (**Table 1**). Consent or assent was provided by the participant, parent, or both. General inclusion criteria were: (1) age 12 – 18 years at time of testing, (2) no current DSM-5 eating disorder, (3) no DSM-5 intellectual disability, (4) no severe acquired brain injury, (5) no history of central nervous system infection, (6) no current substance use more frequent than once per month, (7) no food allergies, (8) no MRI contraindications (e.g., full dental braces, other metallic implants). Co-morbid psychiatric diagnosis was allowed in the OCD group to improve external validity. Specific inclusion criteria for controls were: (1) no previously diagnosed DSM 5[60] disorder (past adjustment disorders and past or present elimination disorders were allowed), (2) no lifetime treatment with psychotropic medication, (3) no first-degree relative with OCD. General exclusion criteria were: (1) structural central nervous system abnormalities, (2) > 2 mm head movement during the scan, (3) failure to comprehend or recall the task instructions. Adolescents with OCD were recruited from 107 consecutive presentations (11/03/2008-09/03/2015) to an OCD clinic freely accessible to the public for children and adolescents residing in a geographical area within Sydney, Australia. Having excluded patients outside the age inclusion criterion at time of the study (n=45) or with a diagnosis of intellectual disability (n=2), 60 candidate participants remained. Telephone contact was attempted with 46, 20 of whom declined to participate, 2 had limited English language proficiency, and 3 had MRI contraindications. The remaining 21 attended for testing, one participant was exluded because the semi-structured clinical assessment excluded OCD. A child and adolescent psychiatrist clinically determined caseness. Recruitment of controls occurred through advertisement, convenience, 'snowball', and a research volunteer registry.

Telephone screening for inclusion criteria and recruitment was undertaken. Participants completed self-report questionnaires that recorded demographics (age, gender, ethnicity, language, and education), medications (agent, dose, and duration), and the Depression Anxiety and Stress Scale [DASS][46]. Pre-morbid intelligence was assessed with the Weschler Ranging Assessment Test [WRAT][47].

All participants in both groups were assessed using the Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Aged (K-SADS –PL 2013). OCD symptom measures[48] were completed for the clinical group. To optimize standardization, all assessments were completed a child and adolescent psychiatry registrar (IEP) who interviewed the participant and one or both parents. A child and adolescent psychiatrist (PLH) provided training and supervision of diagnostic interviews. All clinical assessment data was collected within 24 hours of behavioural experiments.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



**Behavioural stimuli & equipment.**

Outcomes consisted of five different sweet or salty foods (**Table 2**). Task design, stimulus presentation and response recording was controlled by PsychoPy© software (v1.82.00)[64] running on a MacBook© (Apple, CA) computer. Visual stimuli during scanning were displayed a projector placed behind the MRI scanner. A Lumina© MRI-compatible two-button response pad (Cedrus©, California) detected responses. Participants viewed a reflection of the projected image (800 x 600 pixels) in a mirror attached to the scanner headcoil.

**Procedure & setting.**

Participants abstained from eating for three hours prior to the experiment, analogous to cross-species food deprivation to motivate performance. Before training, participants were asked "On a scale of 1 to 10, how hungry are you right now?". Sealed commercial packages of the five foods were opened onto individual plates in front of participants in order to assuage any concerns about contamination (Arnott's Chocolate Tiny Teddy® Biscuits 250g, Doritos® Cheese Supreme Corn Chips 114 g, Cheezels® Cheese Snacks 114 g, Arnott's BBQ Shapes® 250 g, Milk Chocolate M&M'S® 49 g). Participants tasted and rated each food on a 7-point Likert scale ("Very Unpleasant" to "Very Pleasant"). Instrumental and Pavlovian conditioning was conducted in an interview room. Participants were verbally asked 6 open questions assessing their knowledge of the instrumental and Pavlovian associations; if an answer was incorrect then the participant was asked "Could it have been something else?", if all questions were answered correctly then a positive affirmation was given. The Pavlovian-instrumental transfer and outcome revaluation behavioural tests were completed during fMRI data acquisition. Written instructions were shown to participants on the computer monitor. Throughout the task, a virtual 'snack vending machine' image was intermittently presented on the screen. Participants learned how to acquire food rewards from this vending machine. Verbal instruction in response to questions from participants was limited to generic responses such as "Tip the machine to learn how to earn the snacks". To improve reliability, one researcher (IEP) conducted all clinical assessments and behavioural experiments.

**Behavioural Methods.**

***Instrumental conditioning.*** Left (A1) and right (A2) button presses were reinforced with a specific food counterbalanced on a variable-ratio schedule (VR5) across ten experiment versions selected dependent upon each participant's three highest rated foods. The plate of snacks (O1) associated with A1 was placed on the desk on the left-hand side of the participant and the plate of snacks (O2) associated with A2 was placed on the right-hand side of the participant. As each outcome was earned, an image of that food appeared on the screen for 1 second and participants were invited to eat one piece of the relevant food. The following instructions were presented on screen: "You can get free snacks from our vending machine. Tip the machine with the left or right arrows. Learn how to get the different snacks. Press any key to begin". After every third outcome participants were asked: "Which direction did you tilt to get (the outcome)" Feedback was provided ("correct" or "Oops! That was wrong"). Instrumental conditioning ceased after a participant registered six consecutive correct answers.

***Pavlovian conditioning.*** Prior to the start of conditioning the button box was removed. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



three plates holding all three food rewards (O1, O2, O3) involved in Pavlovian conditioning were placed on the desk. Four stimuli (S1, S2, S3, S4) were paired with four outcomes (O1, O2, O3, OØ). Two stimuli (S1, S2) were paired with two outcomes from instrumental conditioning; i.e., ensuring that S1-O1 and S2-O2 were distinct pairs. One of the stimuli (S3) was paired with an outcome (O3) that was not included in instrumental training stage. The fourth and final stimuli (S4) was paired with the word 'EMPTY' indicating that no food was available. The following instructions were presented on screen: "The vending machine cannot be tipped now. But, free snacks will sometimes fall out. Coloured lights will appear on the machine before a snack falls out. Watch the lights and learn which snack will fall out. Questions will test what you learn". Stimuli were presented for 5 seconds, after which the image of the food outcome appeared beneath the stimuli (coloured vending machine) for 1 second — a total of six seconds. The inter-trial-interval (ITI) was 10 (+/-5) s and during the ITI the vending machine was shown without either stimuli (colour) or outcome (food). After every block of four stimuli-outcome trials a multiple-choice question "Which snack will fall out?" appeared on the screen with a stimulus (coloured vending machine), if participants answered this question correctly then they were invited to eat one piece of the relevant outcomes. Pavlovian conditioning ceased after a participant registered six consecutive correct answers.

***Pavlovian-instrumental transfer test.*** For this test the button box was returned and the four stimuli were presented individually for 6 seconds every 18 seconds (0-4 second random jitter). Each stimulus was presented 12 times in random order. Participants were able to tilt the vending machine during stimulus presentation and when the vending machine was unlit during the intertrial interval, providing an active baseline measure. This transfer phase was conducted in extinction, i.e., no outcomes, to ensure that responding was not influenced by change in the incidence of outcome delivery during the test. The following instructions were presented on screen: "The vending machine will now sometimes give free snacks. You will see coloured lights on the machine again. You can tip the machine at any time. No snacks will appear on the screen, but the snacks you earn will be recorded. Remember what you learned before to get all the snacks that you want!" Pavlovian-instrumental transfer data for one participant from each group was missing due to a data recording error, leaving OCD *n*=19 and controls *n*=20.

***Outcome revaluation procedure and test.*** Participants were first shown the following statement on screen: "Now you'll see what has happened to one of the snacks!" After this statement they were shown a 4-minute video of cockroaches crawling on one of the foods (counterbalanced between O1 and O2) they had learned to earn during instrumental conditioning. After the video presentation the following instructions were presented on screen: "You return to the vending machine you saw before. You can tip the machine at any time. No coloured lights or snacks will appear, but a tally will be kept of the snacks you get. Get all the snacks that you want!" The blank vending machine then appeared for 30 trials of 12 seconds each. Before each trial, a fixation cross was presented for 18 (±6) seconds. Participants could tilt the machine or fixation cross at any time. No outcomes were presented during the revaluation test.

***Declarative recall test (post-test questionnaires).*** After the revaluation test, whilst still in the scanner, participants rated the desirability of O1 and O2 on a scale of Likert scale 1 to 7. After exiting the scanner participants re-completed the self-report hunger and food pleasantness scales that were first completed at the start of the behavioural experiments.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



They also completed a self-report six-item multiple-choice test of declarative recall of the instrumental (e.g. 'What snack was associated with the LEFT key?') and Pavlovian (e.g. 'What snack was associated with the BLUE light?') contingencies.

**Imaging methods.**

Scanning occurred in a 3T GE Discovery with a 32-channel head coil (GE Healthcare, UK).

A T1-weighted high-resolution was acquired for each participant for registration and anatomical screening: 7200-msec repetition time; 2700-msec echo time; 176 slices in the sagittal plane; 1-mm slice thickness (no gap); 256-mm field of view; and 256 x 256 matrix.

We acquired 300 T2*-weighted whole-brain echo planar images with a 2910-msec repetition time (TR); 20-msec echo time; 90-degree flip angle; 240-mm field of view; and 128 x 128 matrix with SENSE (Sensitivity Encoding). Each volume consisted of 52 axial slices (2-mm thick) with a 0.2-mm gap. Whole brain diffusion-weighted images were acquired using an echo planar imaging sequence with the following parameters: TR=8250ms; TE=85ms; number of slices=55 thickness=2mm-thick axial slices; matrix size, 128 x 128; in-plane resolution, 1.8 x 1.8mm$^2$; 69 gradient directions. Eight images without gradient loading (B0 s.mm-2) were acquired prior to the acquisition of 69 images with uniform gradient loading (B0=1000s.mm-2).

**Data Analysis.**

Descriptive statistics were calculated and two-tailed t-tests were used for continuous variables and chai-squared for categorical variables in **Table 4** converted selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SSRI) medication doses to standardized mg equivalents for fMRI analysis.[27]

***Pavlovian-instrumental transfer:*** Outcome-specific PIT was determined by a comparison of the rate of the 'same' action and the 'different' action during the S1 and S2 stimulus trials. During S1 trials, the 'same' action was A1 and the 'different' action was A2. During S2 trials, the reverse was true: the 'same' action was A2 and the 'different' action was A1. The number of same and different actions was calculated per trial for each participant. For group differences in behaviour, the average `same` and `different` action rates were summarised per person and included in a 2 (group) x 2 (action) mixed ANOVA, where the interaction determined whether specific PIT was aberrant in OCD. For the fMRI analysis, the difference between the rate of the 'same' action less the 'different' action per trial was calculated, for each person. This vector was used as a parametric task regressor for specific PIT in the fMRI analysis (described below). For the tractography correlation analysis, the average value of each vector representing specific transfer was included as a covariate to determine tract weights related to specific PIT.

**General transfer** was determined by comparing the rate of actions during S3 and S4 stimuli. The action rates (aggregate button-presses) were calculated per trial for each person. For group differences in behaviour, the average S3 and S4 response rates were summarised per person and included in a 2 (group) by 2 (stimulus) mixed ANOVA, where the interaction determined whether general-transfer behaviour was aberrant in OCD. For the fMRI analysis, the vector of these rates was used as a parametric task regressor for general PIT.

Baseline rates were calculated as the total number of button presses per second during

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



presentation of the 'blank' vending machine, and average group differences were tested with a 2-sample t-test.

***Outcome devaluation.*** The effect of the outcome devaluation procedure was determined by the change in food preference ratings across the series of experiments, i.e., Δ value = pre-rating – post-rating. The interaction in a 2 (group) x 2 (pre-post) mixed ANOVA on the change scores indicated whether desire was aberrant in OCD. The effect of devaluation on behaviour was determined by the rate of actions for the still-valued food over actions for the devalued food. The number of still-valued actions and devalued actions was calculated per trial, for each person. Group differences in goal-directed behaviour were tested in a 2 (group) x 2 (action) x 5 (trial bin) mixed ANOVA on the average still-valued and devalued action rates per person, where a significant interaction between group and action (valued vs devalued) indicated aberrant goal-directed behaviour in OCD. Valued action rates per trial were included as a parametric task regressor in the fMRI analysis. The average difference in valued action rates less devalued rates for each person was included in the tractography analyses to determine tract weights related to goal-directed behaviour.

**Magnetic Resonance Imaging**

***Functional (fMRI):*** The data from each run was analyzed separately, using SPM8 (Wellcome Department of Imaging Neuroscience). Structural images were manually inspected for anatomical abnormalities and co-registered to the mean functional image. Functional images were realigned, slice-time corrected, normalized to the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) template space, interpolated to 2 x 2 x 2 mm voxels and smoothed with a Gaussian filter (8-mm full width-half maximum). To correct for movement on image analysis we distinguished inter-subject motion and task-correlated motion. Subject motion can produce image artifacts (e.g., banding) which increases the error term in the statistical model and reduces the likelihood of correctly detecting a significant effect. To address this, we screened each run after movement correction and normalization (i.e., post-processing) for image artefacts using the Artifact Detection Tool from Susan Whitfield-Gabrielli (web.mit.edu/swg/software.htm). For each participant, outlier images were identified using the scan-to-scan differences in movement (mm) and rotation (degree) with default thresholds of 2 mm and 0.2 degrees, respectively. These points were used to construct an outlier regressor for each individual to be added as a covariate in the first-level analysis (see below). This resulted in the exclusion of 2.6 percent of data in the OCD group (highest percent from any single participant was 21.3 percent) while 0.4 percent of data was excluded among the control group. Using the same Artifact Detection Tool, we also manually screened each run for task-correlated motion which will increase the false positive error rate. There were no substantial correlations with any task regressor in our sample, mean r=0.08 (highest r=.19).

The fMRI analyses were conducted in a two-level manner, where the first-level specified a general linear model (GLM) for each participant, and the second-level included the first-level parameters as random effects, to determine group effects. The first-level GLM for the Pavlovian-instrumental transfer test modelled conditioned stimuli as a boxcar function with separate regressors for specific- (S1, S2) and general- (S3, S4) stimuli. We modelled response times as stick functions in a separate regressor of no interest. Following Prevost et al 2012, a parametric regressor modulated the S1 and S2 stimulus blocks by a vector of the difference between `same` and `different` action rates per stimulus as the trial-wise task regressor for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



specific transfer. The S3 and S4 stimulus blocks were parametrically modulated by the vector of total response rates per stimulus, which served as the (trial-wise) task regressor for general transfer. The first-level GLM for the devaluation test included trials as a boxcar function and a regressor-of-no-interest modelling response times as a stick function. A parametric regressor modulated the trial blocks by the number of valued responses, which served as the (trial-wise) task regressor for choices driven by experienced value (following Morris et al 2015). Each task regressor was convolved with the canonical haemodynamic response function (after high-pass filtering with a cut-off of 128 s to remove drifts within sessions). The six movement regressors from realignment and the outlier regressor were also included as regressors-of-no-interest in each GLM.

The resulting parameter estimates (betas) for the task regressors were entered into second-level *t*-tests in SPM8 to generate population-level effect statistics for each group. BOLD activity tracking each task regressor were tested in planned whole-brain one-sample SPM *t*-tests of betas from healthy adolescents , while aberrant BOLD activity in OCD was tested in planned whole-brain two-sample SPM *t*-tests of betas from both groups. Significant regions in each whole-brain analysis, exceeding a voxel level false-discovery rate FDR $q$=.05 are reported here (clustersize threshold $k$=5). Follow-up region-of-interest (ROI) analyses comparing groups in regions implicated by the task regressor in health adolescents were also performed when the planned group comparison was null, and results exceeding a small-volume corrected family-wise error rate $p$=.05 are reported. We also performed ROI analyses for correlations with obsessions (e.g., contamination, disgust, or symmetry) or compulsions, training performance, age, WRAT scores (IQ proxy), handedness, and SSRI medication dose. Significant regions were manually verified using the Atlas of the Human Brain.[66]

**Diffusion Imaging and tractography.**

Diffusion data was first eddy-current corrected using FMRIB Diffusion Toolbox to align all images to a reference b0 image and linearly transform them, brains were extracted, and diffusion tensors fitted. Diffusion probabilistic tractography was then performed using the FDT Diffusion Toolbox.[68] We determined seed masks using clusters of significant activation from the preceding fMRI analysis. For each participant, tractography was performed from every voxel within the seed mask to build up a connectivity distribution. We fitted a three-fibre orientation diffusion model to estimate probability distributions on the direction of fibre populations at each brain voxel in the diffusion space of each participant. To interpret the probabilistic tractography in standard space, we used standard-to-diffusion matrices and the corresponding inversed matrices. We generated 5000 samples from each seed voxel with a curvature threshold of 0.2 and no waypoint or termination masks. Tracking occurred in diffusion space, with results transformed back to MNI space. To visualize tracts efferent and afferent to the seed mask, individual participant 3D files were thresholded to the top 0.02% of tracts and binarized, before being concatenated into a 4D file. This showed the average connectivity, across all participants, for each seed region. FSL (FMRIB Software Library) tools (www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk) were used in all diffusion analyses (version 5.0.1).

We tested for group differences in the estimated strength of tracts efferent and afferent to our seed regions using nonparametric voxelwise statistical testing, and assessed the relationship between tract strength and the behavioural covariates (average rate of specific

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



transfer from the task regressor vector, and the difference between valued and devalued press rates in the first minute, for PIT and outcome devaluation, respectively) with the tract values at each voxel, independently for each of the seed regions.

After group comparisons and voxelwise correlations against the behavioural regressors, the model fit was tested by permutation testing (FSL Randomize), using 25 000 random permutations. Threshold-free cluster enhancement (TFCE) was used to boost signal in areas that exhibit spatial clustering .[69] To protect against false positives, we restricted the analysis to those voxels in which at least half of the participants (n=19) had tracts from the seed mask.[70] In addition, only clusters of at least 20 contiguous voxels are reported.

Resulting statistical maps were thresholded at p=0.05 family-wise error corrected (*FWE*). A significant relationship between white matter tractography values and behavioural regressors at a particular voxel implies variable white matter architecture between (some part of) the seed region and the voxel in question.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank Laura Bradfield for helpful discussions regarding the content of this paper. This research was supported by a post graduate scholarship from the: National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia (#1134268) and research funding from the New South Wales Institute of Psychiatry to IEP; and funding from the Australian Research Council #FL990992409 and a NHMRC Senior Investigator Award GNT1175420 to BWB.

## Author contributions:

Conception: IEP and BWB. Design: IEP, RWM, SQ, KG, FW, MO, PLH, and BWB. Data acquisition: IEP, RWM, SQ, FW, and MO. Data analysis: IEP, RWM, SQ, and KG. Data interpretation: IEP, RWM, SQ, KG, PLH, and BWB. Drafted or substantively revised the manuscript: IEP, RWM, KG, PLH, and BWB. All authors approved the submitted manuscript and agreed both to be personally accountable for the author's own contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work.

## Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest relevant to the current research.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



## References

1. *Goal directed behavior: the concept of action in psychology*. (Erlbaum, 1985).
2. Balleine, B. W. The Meaning of Behavior: Discriminating Reflex and Volition in the Brain. *Neuron* **104**, 47–62 (2019).
3. Balleine, B. W. & Dickinson, A. Goal-directed instrumental action: contingency and incentive learning and their cortical substrates. *Neuropharmacology* **37**, 407–419 (1998).
4. Haber, S. N. & Behrens, T. E. J. The Neural Network Underlying Incentive-Based Learning: Implications for Interpreting Circuit Disruptions in Psychiatric Disorders. *Neuron* **83**, 1019–1039 (2014).
5. Rushworth, M. F. S., Noonan, M. P., Boorman, E. D., Walton, M. E. & Behrens, T. E. Frontal Cortex and Reward-Guided Learning and Decision-Making. *Neuron* **70**, 1054–1069 (2011).
6. Dickinson, A. & Balleine, B. Motivational control of goal-directed action. *Animal Learning & Behavior* **22**, 1–18 (1994).
7. Dickinson, A. & Balleine, B. W. The role of learning in motivation. in *In CR Gallistel (Ed) Learning, Motivation & Emotion, Volume 3 of Steven's Handbook of Experimental Psychology, Third Edition.* 497–533 (John Wiley & Sons, 2002).
8. O'Doherty, J. P., Cockburn, J. & Pauli, W. M. Learning, Reward, and Decision Making. *Annu Rev Psychol* **68**, 73–100 (2017).
9. Rangel, A., Camerer, C. & Montague, P. R. A framework for studying the neurobiology of value-based decision making. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **9**, 545–556 (2008).
10. Balleine, B. W. & O'Doherty, J. P. Human and rodent homologies in action control: corticostriatal determinants of goal-directed and habitual action. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **35**, 48–69 (2010).
11. Verschure, P. F. M. J., Pennartz, C. M. A. & Pezzulo, G. The why, what, where, when and how of goal-directed choice: neuronal and computational principles. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **369**, 20130483 (2014).
12. Dolan, R. J. & Dayan, P. Goals and Habits in the Brain. *Neuron* **80**, 312–325 (2013).
13. Morris, R. W., Quail, S., Griffiths, K. R., Green, M. J. & Balleine, B. W. Corticostriatal control of goal-directed action is impaired in schizophrenia. *Biol. Psychiatry* **77**, 187–195 (2015).
14. Quail, S. L., Laurent, V. & Balleine, B. W. Inhibitory Pavlovian-instrumental transfer in humans. *J Exp Psychol Anim Learn Cogn* **43**, 315–324 (2017).
15. Griffiths, K. R., Morris, R. W. & Balleine, B. W. Translational studies of goal-directed action as a framework for classifying deficits across psychiatric disorders. *Front Syst Neurosci* **8**, 101 (2014).
16. Corbit, L. H. & Balleine, B. W. Instrumental and Pavlovian incentive processes have dissociable effects on components of a heterogeneous instrumental chain. *J Exp Psychol Anim Behav Process* **29**, 99–106 (2003).
17. Erev, I. *et al.* A choice prediction competition: Choices from experience and from description. *J. Behav. Decis. Making* **23**, 15–47 (2010).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



18. Fischer, A. G. & Ullsperger, M. Real and fictive outcomes are processed differently but converge on a common adaptive mechanism. *Neuron* **79**, 1243–1255 (2013).
19. Bradfield, L. A., Dezfouli, A., van Holstein, M., Chieng, B. & Balleine, B. W. Medial Orbitofrontal Cortex Mediates Outcome Retrieval in Partially Observable Task Situations. *Neuron* **88**, 1268–1280 (2015).
20. Heilbronner, S. R., Rodriguez-Romaguera, J., Quirk, G. J., Groenewegen, H. J. & Haber, S. N. Circuit-Based Corticostriatal Homologies Between Rat and Primate. *Biol Psychiatry* **80**, 509–521 (2016).
21. Greenberg, B. D., Rauch, S. L. & Haber, S. N. Invasive circuitry-based neurotherapeutics: stereotactic ablation and deep brain stimulation for OCD. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **35**, 317–336 (2010).
22. Robbins, T. W., Vaghi, M. M. & Banca, P. Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder: Puzzles and Prospects. *Neuron* **102**, 27–47 (2019).
23. Fettes, P., Schulze, L. & Downar, J. Cortico-Striatal-Thalamic Loop Circuits of the Orbitofrontal Cortex: Promising Therapeutic Targets in Psychiatric Illness. *Front Syst Neurosci* **11**, 25 (2017).
24. Cartoni, E., Balleine, B. & Baldassarre, G. Appetitive Pavlovian-instrumental Transfer: A review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* **71**, 829–848 (2016).
25. Corbit, L. H. & Balleine, B. W. Learning and Motivational Processes Contributing to Pavlovian-Instrumental Transfer and Their Neural Bases: Dopamine and Beyond. *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* **27**, 259–289 (2016).
26. Bradfield, L. A., Hart, G. & Balleine, B. W. Inferring action-dependent outcome representations depends on anterior but not posterior medial orbitofrontal cortex. *Neurobiol Learn Mem* **155**, 463–473 (2018).
27. Pauli, W. M., Gentile, G., Collette, S., Tyszka, J. M. & O'Doherty, J. P. Evidence for model-based encoding of Pavlovian contingencies in the human brain. *Nat Commun* **10**, 1099 (2019).
28. Lichtenberg, N. T. *et al.* Basolateral Amygdala to Orbitofrontal Cortex Projections Enable Cue-Triggered Reward Expectations. *J. Neurosci.* **37**, 8374–8384 (2017).
29. Ostlund, S. B. & Balleine, B. W. The contribution of orbitofrontal cortex to action selection. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **1121**, 174–192 (2007).
30. Ostlund, S. B. & Balleine, B. W. Orbitofrontal cortex mediates outcome encoding in Pavlovian but not instrumental conditioning. *J. Neurosci.* **27**, 4819–4825 (2007).
31. Bray, S., Rangel, A., Shimojo, S., Balleine, B. & O'Doherty, J. P. The neural mechanisms underlying the influence of pavlovian cues on human decision making. *J. Neurosci.* **28**, 5861–5866 (2008).
32. Leung, B. K. & Balleine, B. W. The ventral striato-pallidal pathway mediates the effect of predictive learning on choice between goal-directed actions. *J. Neurosci.* **33**, 13848–13860 (2013).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.19.22272645; this version posted March 21, 2022. 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.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.



33. Leung, B. K. & Balleine, B. W. Ventral pallidal projections to mediodorsal thalamus and ventral tegmental area play distinct roles in outcome-specific Pavlovian-instrumental transfer. *J. Neurosci.* **35**, 4953–4964 (2015).
34. Parkinson, J. A., Cardinal, R. N. & Everitt, B. J. Limbic cortical-ventral striatal systems underlying appetitive conditioning. *Prog. Brain Res.* **126**, 263–285 (2000).
35. Corbit, L. H. & Balleine, B. W. The general and outcome-specific forms of Pavlovian-instrumental transfer are differentially mediated by the nucleus accumbens core and shell. *J. Neurosci.* **31**, 11786–11794 (2011).
36. Maia, T. V., Cooney, R. E. & Peterson, B. S. The neural bases of obsessive–compulsive disorder in children and adults. *Dev Psychopathol* **20**, 1251–1283 (2008).
37. Modell, J. G., Mountz, J. M., Curtis, G. C. & Greden, J. F. Neurophysiologic dysfunction in basal ganglia/limbic striatal and thalamocortical circuits as a pathogenetic mechanism of obsessive-compulsive disorder. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* **1**, 27–36 (1989).
38. Morris, R. W., Dezfouli, A., Griffiths, K. R. & Balleine, B. W. Action-value comparisons in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex control choice between goal-directed actions. *Nat Commun* **5**, 4390 (2014).
39. Gillan, C. M. & Robbins, T. W. Goal-directed learning and obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci.* **369**, (2014).
40. Gillan, C. M., Kosinski, M., Whelan, R., Phelps, E. A. & Daw, N. D. Characterizing a psychiatric symptom dimension related to deficits in goal-directed control. *Elife* **5**, (2016).
41. Pauls, D. L., Alsobrook, J. P., Goodman, W., Rasmussen, S. & Leckman, J. F. A family study of obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Am J Psychiatry* **152**, 76–84 (1995).
42. van Grootheest, D. S., Cath, D. C., Beekman, A. T. & Boomsma, D. I. Twin studies on obsessive-compulsive disorder: a review. *Twin Res Hum Genet* **8**, 450–458 (2005).
43. Leonard, H. L., Goldberger, E. L., Rapoport, J. L., Cheslow, D. L. & Swedo, S. E. Childhood Rituals: Normal Development or Obsessive-Compulsive Symptoms? *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* **29**, 17–23 (1990).
44. Dar, R., Kahn, D. T. & Carmeli, R. The relationship between sensory processing, childhood rituals and obsessive-compulsive symptoms. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry* **43**, 679–684 (2012).
45. Marzuki, A. A., Pereira de Souza, A. M. F. L., Sahakian, B. J. & Robbins, T. W. Are candidate neurocognitive endophenotypes of OCD present in paediatric patients? A systematic review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* **108**, 617–645 (2020).
46. Henry, J. D. & Crawford, J. R. The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS-21): construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *Br J Clin Psychol* **44**, 227–239 (2005).
47. Wilkinson, G. S. & Robertson, G. J. *Wide range achievement test (WRAT4).* (Lutz, 2006).
48. Scahill, L. *et al.* Children's Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale: reliability and validity. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* **36**, 844–852 (1997).