Modelling model-based and model-free decision-making in a transdiagnostic sample to investigate disorder-specific and transdiagnostic alterations

Franziska Knolle*[1,2,3], Pritha Sen[1,2], Adam Culbreth[4], Kathrin Koch[1,2], Benita Schmitz-Koep[1,2], Deniz A. Gürsel[1,2], Klaus Wunderlich[1,2], Mihai Avram[5], Christian Sorg[1,2,6], Felix Brandl[2,6]

1 School of Medicine and Health, Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

2 School of Medicine and Health, TUM-NIC Neuroimaging Center, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

3 Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

4 Department of Psychiatry, Maryland Psychiatric Research Center, University of Maryland, School of Medicine, Baltimore, USA

5 Translational Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Lübeck, Lübeck, Germany

6 Technical University of Munich, School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, Munich, Germany

Keywords: Transdiagnostic; Schizophrenia; Depression; Obsessive-compulsive disorder; Model-based; Model-free; Win-stay; Decision-Making; Reward Processing; Two-step task

Number of words in abstract: 290
Number of words in text: 4992
Number of figures: 4
Number of tables: 2

*corresponding author:
Dr. Franziska Knolle
Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, School of Medicine and Health, Klinikum rechts der Isar, Technical University Munich, 81675 Munich, Germany
Phone: +49 89 4041 7976 Fax: +49 89 4140 4653
Email: franziska.knolle@tum.de ORCID: 0000-0002-9542-613X

Abstract

Alterations in decision-making have been suggested to underlie different psychiatric illnesses, such as major depressive disorder (MDD), obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), and schizophrenia. Studies report overlapping and divergent alterations in individuals diagnosed with these disorders, which have been linked to symptoms of the respective disorders. One symptom characterizing all these disorders is impaired decision-making. To facilitate early diagnosis and treatment among these disorders which may also show comorbidities among each other, it is crucial to disentangle alterations in decision-making that are unique to specific disorders, from those that occur across diagnostic boundaries. Recent developments in computational modelling have enabled a mechanistic deconstruction of decision-making processes, facilitating the identification of disorder specific and disorder general alterations. We, therefore, employed two computational modelling approaches on to a two-step Markov decision task in a transdiagnostic cohort combining individuals diagnosed with MDD (N=23), OCD (N=25), and schizophrenia (N=27) to identify disorder specific and disorder general decision-making alterations, and associations with symptoms. The results revealed overall reliance on model-free decision-making behavior across all participants. Additionally, schizophrenia patients showed the lowest learning rate in stage one and highest switching rate (lowest perseverance) compared to all other groups. All patient groups were more random in their response profiles than controls in stage two, with schizophrenia patients revealing highest levels of randomness, while OCD patients were additionally more random in stage one compared to controls and MDD patients. Importantly, the findings revealed a correlation between increased model-free behavior and elevated depressive symptoms, while more model-based choices were linked to lower levels of anhedonia across all patients. Consequently, this study shows noteworthy disorder general and disorder specific decision-making alterations in individuals diagnosed with MDD, OCD, and schizophrenia, suggesting that concurrent alterations and symptoms might potentially have common underlying behavioral mechanisms.

1 Introduction

Decision-making and learning impairments are core characteristics of a wide range of psychiatric disorders[1–3] such as major depressive disorder (MDD) [4,5], obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) [6,7], and schizophrenia [8,9]. Therefore, it is important to identify shared decision-making alterations and those specific to each condition in transdiagnostic samples, and understand symptom associations. A better understanding of these associations may have the potential to offer a more precise and nuanced characterization of these deficits which may serve invaluable in facilitating early diagnosis and implementing therapeutic rehabilitation strategies for these patients.

MDD has been associated with a persistence of core symptoms such as anhedonia, rumination, and a cognitive bias [10–12]. This persistence has been explained using a decision-theoretic approach [13,14] suggesting the contribution of alterations in reward anticipation [15,16], effort-cost evaluation [17–19], and a negative bias [20,21] during decision-making as one of the underlying mechanisms. Using a cognitive effort-based decision-making task which is unconfounded by physical effort and temporal delay, Ang and colleagues [22] demonstrated that MDD patients exhibited a steeper discounting of rewards based on effort and demonstrated a reduced willingness to invest cognitive effort for rewards when compared to the healthy control group. Similarly, an earlier study by Treadway and colleagues [19] using an Effort Expenditure for Rewards Task demonstrated that MDD patients were not only less inclined to expend efforts for rewards and less able to use information about reward magnitude and probabilities for optimal decision-making, but also that motivational deficits were associated with higher symptom severity. Furthermore, general deficits in reinforcement learning especially in association with brain signals in response to reward prediction error and expected value (i.e., wanting), with decreased reward sensitivity (i.e., liking) and model-free (i.e., habitual) or model-based (i.e., goal-directed) learning have been proposed [23–26]. In probabilistic reward learning tasks, healthy individuals typically exhibit a preference for frequently rewarded choices, while individuals with MDD often do not display this preference, and this deficit is correlated with anhedonia scores [27,28]. In conclusion, core symptoms of MDD have been linked to reward-related mechanisms using cognitive neuroscience approaches.

OCD is characterized by chronic doubting, and compulsive behaviors which is reflected in dysfunctional decision-making [29]. OCD patients show an inability to adapt the perception of reward and tend to make rigid and repetitive decisions [30]. Various studies suggest that OCD may result from dysfunctional goal-directed control and an over-reliance on habitual control [6,31,32]. There is conflicting evidence for symptom severity effects on abnormal decision-making. Some studies suggest that symptoms are linked to the inability of patients to regulate their thoughts in a goal-directed manner [33–35], while others suggest impaired decision-making to be a characteristic trait unrelated to severity of symptoms [6,36]. This

inconsistency in the literature may be partially explained by effects of illness duration [36]. In a probabilistic learning paradigm, Murray and colleagues [37] reported dysfunctions during reward processing in OCD which may be of dopaminergic origin, which is similar to those alterations seen in schizophrenia patients [38–40]. Furthermore, in a two-step decision-making task, OCD individuals employed more model-free choices in rewarded outcomes, and more model-based choices in loss outcomes, with severity of compulsions being linked to habitual learning of rewarded outcomes, and severity of obsessions being linked to increased choice switching following loss outcomes [41]. Various imaging studies have also indicated altered activations in brain regions that are associated with habit formation [42–45]. As habit formation is based in decision making, this indicates the importance of investigating decision-making alterations in these individuals.

In patients with schizophrenia, dysfunctional decision-making is associated with both positive (i.e., hallucinations and delusions) as well as negative symptoms (i.e., apathy, social withdrawal, depression) [8,46]. Delusions have been linked to a tendency of making confident decisions using inadequate information, a cognitive bias that has been termed as "jumping-to-conclusions" [47–49], which can lead to hasty judgements and formation of false beliefs [46]. Consistently, deficits in reward anticipation [50–52], prediction error processing [38–40] and reward and punishment sensitivity [53–55] have been shown in early and late stages of schizophrenia. Furthermore, research has proposed that alterations in reward processing may result in an inability to accurately assess and utilize future rewards for guiding decision-making, ultimately contributing to a lack of motivation and apathy [56–58]. Impaired habitual decision-making has also been identified as a contributing factor to negative symptoms in schizophrenia [59]. Abnormal effort-based decision-making may be linked to motivational anhedonia in psychosis as schizophrenia patients are unwilling to expend effort to gain rewards [60–62]. Additionally, in comparison with controls, schizophrenia patients also show decreased reliance on goal-directed decision-making [63], together indicating more unpredictable and inconsistent choice behaviors in these individuals when compared to controls.

The literature mentioned above also generally suggests that psychiatric disorders such as OCD, MDD and schizophrenia show alterations in distinct reinforcement learning systems [59,63–68] that constitute the neurobiological basis for model-free and model-based decision-making –which, in turn, allows for the investigation of habitual and goal-directed decision-making processes respectively [69]. Model-free and model-based decisions can be dissociated experimentally using the well characterized two-step Markov decision task formulated by Daw and colleagues [69]. However, no study has yet investigated model-free and model-based decision-making in a transdiagnostic sample of individuals meeting criteria for psychiatric disorders. Therefore, the goal of the current study is to identify disorder specific and disorder general decision-making alterations using the two-step task within a transdiagnostic sample consisting

of patients with MDD, OCD, and schizophrenia in psychotic remission, applying different computational modelling approaches, and linking them to symptoms. Based on past literature, we expected the MDD patients to perform the task better than the other patient groups, possibly showing a mixture of both, model-based and model-free, decision-making strategies; furthermore, we expected OCD patients to exhibit more model-free decisions; and the schizophrenia patients to be model-free but generally more random in their choice behaviors. We also expected decision-making impairments in each sample to be correlated with their respective symptoms. Moreover, we expected that co-occurring symptoms would be associated in the same directionality with decision-making behaviors in these groups. For example, since schizophrenia patients in remission often experience depressive symptoms, we expected depression scores in MDD and schizophrenia patients to be showing a similar correlation trends with decision-making parameters.

2 Methods

2.1 Participants

A total of 100 individuals took part in the study, including 25 healthy controls (HC), 23 MDD patients, 25 OCD patients, and 27 schizophrenia (SCZ) patients in psychotic remission. The demographic characteristics, along with cognitive as well as clinical scores of the participants are summarized in Table 1. Patients met Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM)-IV criteria for SCZ, MDD, and OCD [70]. For schizophrenia patients, psychotic remission was based on Andreasen criteria [71], with a score of ≤3 for each Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) positive item. MDD patients were in an acute depressive episode. Medication for all patients was kept stable for at least two weeks before assessments. The study was approved by the Technical University of Munich ethics committee. All participants gave their informed, written consent after receiving a complete description of the study.

2.2 Task description

All participants completed the two-step task replicated from the study by Daw and colleagues [69] (Figure 1), which is a reinforcement learning task allowing the discrimination between model-free and model-based decision-making. All participants performed this task first outside and then inside an fMRI scanner, but only data from outside the scanner was used in this study. For imaging results see [59], Brandl et al. (in submission), Sen et al (in submission). The goal of the task was to maximize the monetary reward over 200 trials. Specifically, each participant completed four blocks of 50 trials each. Each trial had two decision stages. In both the stages, the participants were asked to select one of two presented fractal images. Depending on their choice in stage one, a specific set of two images of two possible sets was presented on stage two. Transitions between stage one and two were probabilistic. On common transitions, choosing image A on stage one led to 'set a', and image B led to 'set b' with probability of

70%. In 30% of the trials, an uncommon transition occurred when image A led to 'set b' and image B led to 'set a'. Common and uncommon transitions were randomly distributed across all the trials. In stage two, participants again were required to select one image, which ultimately led to receiving a reward or no reward. Transition probabilities were fixed across the experiment; however, the reward probability changed slowly and independently based on Gaussian random walks within the range of 0.25 to 0.75 (Figure 1).

Based on the feedback in stage two, the participants were expected to develop a strategy that maximizes the chances of obtaining a reward. For a model-based decision, the subject must use knowledge of transition probabilities between the states to infer the likelihood that a particular action will lead to a reward. In model-free decision-making, however, the transition behavior between the states is not considered and the current value of each action is updated on the basis of whether actions were rewarded in the preceding trial. For example, when receiving a reward after an uncommon transition, a model-based agent will be expected to change her decision in the first stage on the next trial (i.e., low stay probability), as she is aware that the other option on stage one has a greater likelihood of producing the same set as the last trial. A model-free agent however will repeat the same selection on the next trial as she is solely driven by the outcome (i.e., high stay probability).

Table 1. Demographic characteristics, clinical characteristics, and the cognitive function of the healthy controls and patients with major depressive disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and schizophrenia

	CON (n=25)	MDD (*n*=23)	OCD (*n*=25)	SCZ (*n*=27)	Group Differences
Demographic characteristics					
Age	36.6 (11.9)	41.6 (15.4)	33.8 (12.5)	40.9 (11.9)	H (3, 100)=7.405, p=ns
Gender	15M, 10F	9M, 14F	5M, 20F	18M, 8F	χ2 (3, 100)=15.4, p<0.001
Cognitive score					
Symbol-coding task	60 (10.6)	53 (3.32)	57.5 (10.6)	41.6 (9.62)	H (3, 100)=28.802, p<0.001
Clinical Scores					
HAMD	1.48 (1.81)	13.5 (3.01)	12.6 (4.75)	3.65 (2.38)	H (3, 100)=69.863, p<0.001
PANSS					
Positive	7 (0)	7.52 (0.68)	7.68 (0.748)	10.9 (3.46)	H (3, 100)=12.67, p=0.005
Negative	7 (0)	12.4 (3.11)	8.2 (0.913)	14.8 (6.12)	H (3, 100)=62.235, p<0.001
General	16.7 (0.802)	27 (3.57)	22.2 (3.06)	25.9 (7.11)	H (3, 100)=59.931, p<0.001
Total	30.6 (0.783)	47.6 (6.12)	37.6 (3.11)	50.5 (12)	H (3, 100)=68.52, p<0.001
YBOCS	0	0	21.2 (6.74)	0	H (3, 100)=58.659, p<0.001
OCI-R	NA	NA	26.8 (9.76)	NA	
Anhedonia					
Chapman Social	4.16 (2.91)	11.6 (4.62)	9.72 (6.1)	9 (3.95)	H (3, 100)=28.859, p<0.001
Chapman Physical	2.08 (1.21)	5.83 (3.51)	5.28 (3.61)	4.89 (3.19)	H (3, 100)=17.726, p<0.001
Chapman Total	5.65 (2.76)	17.4 (7.20)	15 (8.11)	14.3 (6.85)	H (3, 100)=32.403, p<0.001

Note: Data are presented as mean (SD) except for Gender. Abbreviations: ns=non-significant; CON, healthy controls; MDD, major depressive disorder patients; SCZ, schizophrenia patients, OCD, obsessive-compulsive disorder patients; SCZ, schizophrenia patients; n, number of subjects; M, male; F, female; HAMD, Hamilton Depression Scale[72]; PANSS, Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale[73]; Y-BOCS, Yale-Brown Obsessive-Compulsive Scale[74], OCI-R, Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory – Revised[75]; Scales for Physical and Social Anhedonia – Chapman[76]; Symbol coding task of the Brief Assessment of Cognition in Schizophrenia (BACS)[77]



Figure 1 Two-step Markov decision task. Showing the state transition structure which allows discrimination between model-based and model-free behavior. Note: All stimuli in stage 2 are associated with a probabilistic reward changing slowly and independently based on Gaussian random walks, forcing subjects to continuously learn and explore the second stage choices.

2.3 Analysis

2.3.1 Stay Probability

Stay-probability was assessed to investigate an action bias. It is the probability of an individual selecting the same first stage choice as in the previous trial, which can show a model-free or a model-based strategy depending on the results of the previous trial (i.e., outcome and transition type). See paragraph above or supplements for exact description. Stay-probabilities were compared across groups using a mixed ANOVA with stay probability as the dependent variable, group as the between-subject variable, and previous trial transition type (common or uncommon) and previous trial outcome (rewarded or unrewarded) as within-subject variables. For post-hoc analysis for the factors that resulted in a

significant effect, we performed pairwise t-tests corrected for multiple comparisons using Bonferroni adjustments for each of the parameters.

2.3.2 Logistic Regression Analysis

We used a hierarchical logistic regression to estimate model-free and model-based decision-making by including independent contributions of choices (coded: stay or shift) on the subject level depending on outcome (coded: rewarded and unrewarded) and transition type of the previous trial (coded: common and uncommon). We also controlled for BACS and illness duration by employing them as fixed effects. The equation for the model that we fit is as follows:

stay ~ 1 + reward_previous + transition_type + reward_previous * transition_type + BACS + Illness_duration + (1 + transition_type + reward_previous + reward_previous * transition_type | Subject)

We then extracted individual beta estimates for reward reflecting model-free behavior and for the interaction of reward and transition reflecting model-based behavior for each individual subject to explore which decision-making strategy individuals were more likely to use. We performed a robust mixed ANOVA and robust post hoc tests for significant effects based on trimmed means using the bootstrap method, with beta estimates as the dependent variable, group as the between-subject factor and decision-making strategy (reward beta: model-free and interaction beta: model-based) as the within-subject factor. We then conducted port-hoc analyses for significant effects using one-way robust ANOVA with the bootstrap method.

To explore associations of the beta estimates with clinical scores, we then computed, across and within all groups, Spearman's correlations. We had to exclude one participant from the MDD group for this analysis due to missing values.

2.3.3 Computational Modelling

We also used hierarchical Bayesian to estimate computational parameters describing neurocognitive processes underlying decision-making behavior. We fitted four models using the hBayesDM package (version 1.2.1) [78] for R using Stan (version 2.26.3) [79]. We fitted four chains for each model with 1,000 burn-in samples and 3,000 samples. For more details refer to Ahn and colleagues [78]. All models are shown in Table 2, and were fitted to three pieces of information per trial: stage 1 choice (1,2), stage 2 choice (1:4); reward (0, 1).

Parameter for all models were fitted under one hierarchical prior across all subjects independent of group (Table 2). The winning model was determined based on model-convergence and lowest leave one out information criterion (LOOIC) values. The 6-parameter model was found to be the winning model.

Table 2. Models with LOOIC values

Model	Description	Parameters	LOOIC
4-parameter	As implemented by Wunderlich and colleagues [80], this model comprised of the following four parameters: **Learning rate ('α'):** showing the efficiency of learning over the trials, the higher the score, the better the subjects understand and perform the task **Inverse-temperature/choice randomness ('β'):** influence of reward prediction on choices, beta referring to the proportions of random choices made during the task, with β=0 for completely random responding and β=∞ for deterministically choosing the highest value option **Perseverance ('π'):** Perseverance determines how strongly the subject(s) stick to their decisions. The higher the score on the perseverance scale, the lower the chance of switching to a different image. **Model-weights ('ω'):** referring to the degree of model-based influence on choices, takes values from 0 to 1, '0' indicating more model-free decisions, and '1' being more model-based.	α, β, π, ω	39841.237
5-parameter	Five-parameter model: As implemented by Culbreth and colleagues (Culbreth et al., 2016), in addition to 'α' and 'π', this model had 'β-	α, β-1MF, β-1MB, β-2, π	40083.131

	1MF' and 'β-1MB' (choice randomness in stage 1 for model-free and model-based choices respectively), and 'β-2' (choice randomness for decisions in stage 2)		
6-parameter	Six-parameter model: In addition to 'β-1' (choice randomness in stage 1, not separate for model-free and model-based choices), 'β-2', 'π', and 'ω', this model included 'α-1' and 'α-2' referring to the learning rate of stage 1 and stage 2 respectively	α-1, α-2, β-1, β-2, π, ω	39160.12
7-parameter	Seven-parameter model: An extension of the six-parameter model as implemented in the study by Daw and colleagues [69], included the above-mentioned six parameters along with 'λ' (eligibility parameter, governing the relative importance of model-free and model-based reinforcer, with λ=1 in which only the final reward is important, and λ=0 in which only the second-stage value plays a role).	α-1, α-2, β-1, β-2, π, ω, **λ**	No convergence

After removing outliers (see description below), we explored group differences for the modelling parameters using robust one-way ANOVA followed by robust post-hoc tests for significant effects corrected for multiple comparisons using Bonferroni adjustments based on trimmed means with bootstrapping method, with each parameter as the dependent variable and group as the between subject variable.

To study the associations between modelling parameters and clinical scores, we performed partial Spearman's correlations controlling for cognitive function using the symbol-coding task of the BACS, as decision-making is highly dependent on cognitive abilities, and illness duration. These correlations were performed across and within all groups. We focused on the parameters model weights ω to reflect the concept of model-free (<0.5) and model-based (>0.5) behavior more closely, and on perseverance π which reflects stickiness or the ability of being able to change a response pattern. We had to exclude one participant from the MDD group for this analysis due to missing values. See supplements for additional correlations.

2.3.4. General procedure

All statistical analyses were conducted using the R Statistical Software (version 4.1.1) [81]. Data was visualized using the ggplot2 package (version 3.4.2) [82], the ggpubr package (version 0.6.0) [83], and the Hmisc package (version 4.5-0) [84]. Shapiro-Wilks tests, ANOVA analyses, t-tests, were conducted with the rstatix package (version 0.7.2) [85]. Robust ANOVAs and robust post-hoc tests were conducted using the WRS2 package (version 1.1-4) [86]. Correlation analyses were completed and visualized with the ggcorrplot package (version 0.1.3) [87]. Partial correlations were implemented using the ppcor package (version 1.1) [88]. Logistic regression analysis was carried out using the lmer4 package (version 1.1-33) [89].

Before assessing for group-comparisons, data was inspected for normality of distribution using Shapiro-Wilks test. If data was normally distributed, ANOVA and t-tests were conducted, and if assumptions for normality were not met (Shapiro-Wilks $p>0.05$), robust ANOVA and robust post hoc tests were conducted based on 20% trimmed means and 2000 bootstrap samples. Spearman Rank tests were used for correlation analyses. Correlations were not controlled for multiple comparison due to the explorative nature of the correlations, which if significant require validation in future studies and the small sample sizes of each groups, which would otherwise lead to excessively conservative results. Correlations across all participants are presented in the supplementary material. In all the tests, a p-value<0.05 was considered significant.

Potential outliers with values >1.5 times the interquartile range of the respective score were identified and excluded from the dataset. Outlier exclusion has only been applied to those analyses were stated.

3. Results

3.1 Task earning

To assess whether participants understood the task we compared task outcomes for each group contrasting the first and the last 50 trials. There was a significant effect for first and last trials, but not for group or the interaction between both, indicating that all groups performed similarly independent of the strategy. See supplements for details. Interestingly the results indicated that all participants did worse on the last 50 trials.

3.2 Stay probability – Group differences

The mixed factor ANOVA identified significant main effects of group ($F(3, 96)=6.61$, $p<0.001$; $\eta_p^2=0.17$) and reward outcome in previous trial ($F(1, 96)=43.08$, $p<0.001$; $\eta_p^2=0.31$), and significant interaction effects between group and reward outcome in previous trial ($F(3, 96)=2.99$, $p=0.035$; $\eta_p^2=0.09$), and transition type in previous trial and reward outcome in previous trial ($F(1, 96)=6.46$, $p=0.013$; $\eta_p^2=0.06$).

Post hoc tests for each of these significant effects are displayed in the supplementary material in Supplementary Table 1. Stay probabilities for ideal model-free and model-based behavior are displayed in Figure 2a and actual stay probabilities in the current task are displayed in Figure 2b. The visual inspection and comparison to simulated behavior revealed that controls and OCD patients employed model-free decision-making behavior, MDD patients used a hybrid strategy and schizophrenia patients were largely random in their choice profile.



Figure 2 Ideal and actual stay probabilities. Note: (a) Ideal, simulated model-based decision-making behavior: Model-free reinforcement learning predicts that a first-stage choice yielding a reward is likely to be repeated on the upcoming trial, regardless of a common or an uncommon transition; Ideal model-based decision-making behavior: Model-based reinforcement learning predicts that an uncommon transition should affect the value of the next first stage option, leading to a predicted interaction between reward and transition probability; (b) Rewarded trials, independent of transition show higher stay probabilities across healthy controls, MDD and OCD suggesting increased model-free behavior; the plot slightly displays an influence of both strategies in MDD; and random choice behavior in in schizophrenia (SCZ) patients.

3.3 Logistic regression results and correlations

The robust mixed ANOVA revealed a significant effect for the decision-making strategy ($F(1,50.51)=20.43$, $p<0.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.42$), but no effect for group or an interaction. Post-hoc tests revealed that all participants favored model-free decision strategies (Mean=0.034, SD=0.08) over model-based decisions (Mean=-0.03 e^{-9}, SD=0.01), psihat=0.05, $p<0.001$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.08]. Based on our hypotheses, we investigated group differences within model-free and model-based behavior separately comparing individual betas for reward and reward*transition, respectively. We found a significant difference for the estimate of model-free decision-making – reward beta ($F(3,30.91)=3.84$, $p=0.03$, $\eta_p^2=0.48$); but no differences for model-based behavior. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons revealed that MDD patients and OCD patients employed significantly more model-free behavior compared to schizophrenia patients (Supplementary Table 2).

Correlation analyses revealed a significant positive correlation between reward beta and HAMD ($r=0.34$, $p=0.004$) across all patients, indicating that more model-free behavior is linked to stronger depressive symptoms (Figure 3a); and a trend negative correlation between reward-transition beta and total Chapman anhedonia ($r=-0.21$, $p=0.075$), indicating that more model-based behavior would be associated with less anhedonia (Figure 3b). Within groups separately, we only found a negative correlation between reward beta and HAMD in MDD patients ($r=-0.52$, $p=0.02$), indicating that more model-free behavior is associated with fewer depressive symptoms. This correlation is driven by two individuals, see supplements for further analysis.



Figure 3 Correlations between model-free and model-based behavior and clinical scores across all groups. (a) reward beta estimate from the logistic regression and HAMD (b) reward x transition interaction beta estimate from the logistic regression and Anhedonia total (c) Perseverance (π) from the computational model and HAMD (d) Model-weights (ω) from the computational model and Anhedonia – Total.

3.4 Modelling parameters – Group differences

The computational modelling analysis allowed the investigation of differences in six computational parameters underlying the decision-making behavior. Significant group differences (Figure 4) were identified in the learning rate at stage one α-1 ($F(3,22.04)=9.12$, $p=0.01$, $\eta_p^2=0.43$), but not in the learning rate at stage two, in the choice randomness at stage one β-1 ($F(3,29.16)=3.52$, $p=0.06$, $\eta_p^2=0.41$) and stage two β-2 ($F(3,30.07)=9.68$, $p=0.002$, $\eta_p^2=0.68$), and the perseverance π ($F(3, 29.58)=11.05$, $p<0.001$, $\eta_p^2=0.51$). Although not showing any group differences the parameter model weights (ω) indicating model-free vs model-based behavior showed clear evidence for model-free behavior in all groups. Post-hoc analyses (Supplementary Table 3) showed that schizophrenia patients learned least at stage 1, while there were no differences at stage 2. Furthermore, they revealed that OCD patients were significantly more random at stage 1 compared to controls and MDD patients, while schizophrenia patients were more random at stage 2 compared to all other groups. Lastly, the post-hoc analyses showed that perseverance was lowest in schizophrenia patients compared to all other groups.



Figure 4 Group differences in model-parameters. Note: (a) Learning rate stage 1 (α-1); (b) Inverse temperature stage 2 (β-1); (c) Learning rate stage 1 (α-1); (d) Inverse temperature stage 2 (β-2); (e) Perseverance (π); (f) Model-weights (ω); Group differences are calculated with robust post-hoc tests based on trimmed means using bootsrapping method *: significant differences at p<0.05; **: significant differences at p<0.01; ***: significant differences at p<0.001; ; ****: significant differences at p<0.0001; p-values are adjusted using Bonferroni correction. The individual box plots represent the minimum, maximum, median, first quartile and third quartile and the outliers in the data set.

Across all patients, correlation analyses revealed a significant positive correlation between perseveration and HAMD (r=0.269, p=0.047), indicating that greater unwillingness to adapt the decision strategy was linked to stronger depressive symptoms (Figure 3c); and a significant negative correlation between model weights and total anhedonia (r=-0.271, p=0.047), indicating that more model-based behavior would be associated with less anhedonia (Figure 3d). Within groups separately, we found a negative correlation between perseverance and total anhedonia in control subjects (r=-0.48, p=0.038), indicating that more model-free behavior is associated with less anhedonia, and a trend negative correlation between model weights and total anhedonia, again, in control subjects (r=-0.39, p=0.098), indicating that more model-based behavior is also associated with less anhedonia.

Additionally, we explored association between modelling parameters and beta estimates from logistic regressions. The results are presented in the supplementary materials.

Discussion

In this study, we explored disorder general and disorder specific model-free and model-based decision-making alterations and symptom associations in a transdiagnostic sample with individuals diagnosed with MDD, OCD and schizophrenia using different analytical approaches. The stay probabilities revealed that controls and OCD patients employed clear model-free decision-making behavior, while the MDD patients used a hybrid strategy, and the schizophrenia patients were largely random in their decision-making, confirming our hypotheses with regard to the patient groups for whom we expected more model-based behavior. These findings were quantified by two computational analyses. The regression analysis confirmed a reliance on model-free decision-making strategies across all participants and revealed that this was stronger in OCD and MDD patients compared to the random behavior in schizophrenia patients. The Bayesian analysis revealed additional differences between the groups. It showed that schizophrenia patients in comparison to all other groups showed the lowest first-stage learning rate and the lowest perseveration, both confirming random behavior. Furthermore, it showed that at stage one, OCD patients showed lowest influence of reward (choice randomness) compared to controls and MDD patients, whereas, at stage two schizophrenia patients showed the least influence of reward compared to all groups, and MDD and OCD patients also showed lower influence compared to controls. The results, furthermore, revealed some symptom correlations, all such correlations are controlled for cognitive abilities (symbol-coding task of BACS) and illness duration. Across all patients, we found that more model-free decision-making behavior, measured in reward beta and perseverance, was linked to stronger depressive symptoms (HAMD). Importantly, we also found that more model-based decision-making behavior, measured in transition-reward beta and model weights, was associated with lower anhedonia, across all patients. Within the individual patient groups, we only found that reward beta, reflecting model-free behavior, was negatively correlated with depressive symptoms in MDD. No other correlations reached significance. The study's results indicated disorder general alterations in a transdiagnostic sample that shed light on similarities, and may provide starting points for behavior-based interventions. Disorder general and specific alterations in decision-making will be discussed group by group.

While all groups showed a preference for model-free behavior inspecting the stay-probabilities, the MDD group showed to some extent hybrid model-free decision-making behavior. This finding was quantified by the Bayesian computational parameters, which revealed that choice randomness in MDD patients was lowest compared to all other groups at the first stage, whereas choices at the second stage were more random compared to controls, but less random compared to all other groups. Although this is, to our knowledge, the first time that model-free and model-based decision-making has been investigated in patients with depression using a task that requires both strategies such as the two-step

task, research from healthy individuals with depressive symptoms indicated similar results. Blanco and colleagues [90] showed in an earlier study using a leap frog task, that depressive participants used a reflexive, model-free decision-making strategies which did not integrate environmental changes and explored randomly. Similarly, Heller and colleagues [67], suggested that individuals with stronger depressive symptoms transitioned to model-free behavior when exposed to stress. This is interesting as research has shown and discussed the link between stress and depression, and consistently shown that individuals with stronger depression, or with MDD also reported higher levels of stress [91–93] and depressive symptoms respectively. Importantly, this notion is supported by the symptom correlations that we found across all patients. These indicated a reduction of depressive symptoms with less model-free behavior and consistently a reduction of anhedonia with more model-based decision-making behavior. Interestingly, within the MDD group alone we found a negative correlation between model-free behavior and depressive symptom, indicating, fewer symptoms with more model-free behavior. This is in contrast to the overall correlation. We argue that while most MDD patients align with the correlation reported across all patients, only two individuals are driving this negative correlation, without whom the correlation within the MDDs is no longer significant, but remains across all patients (see supplementary materials for supportive analyses). Also, it has been shown that reward processing is sensitive to medication doses [94] which could additionally impact the correlation.

Our results, furthermore, showed that the OCD group used stronger model-free behavior compared to controls, which is consistent with the literature [31,41,95]. For example, Voon and colleagues [41] found that OCD patients showed less goal-directed, model-based and more habitual, model-free choices to rewarding outcomes also using the two-step task. The increased model-free behavior was linked to stronger obsessions [41]. Thus, this overreliance on habituated behavior [30] has been linked to the inability of inhibiting established responses, especially in novel situations. This may be due to difficulties in shifting attention from one aspect of a stimulus to another, and in suppressing or reverting to previously rewarded responses [96,97]. As individuals with OCD also exhibit neurocognitive deficits in attentional and extra-dimensional set-shifting, affective set-shifting and reversal learning, as well as task shifting [98,99], this cognitive inflexibility may underlie the inability to dynamically balancing between model-free and model-based decision-making. While all analyses in our study confirmed a clear reliance on model-free decision-making behavior, the Bayesian computational parameters also revealed that decisions made by OCD patients were largely random, as seen by the decreased impact of preceding rewards (i.e., increased choice randomness) and more choice switches (i.e., reduced perseverance). These computational parameters indicate increased random exploration, which has been linked to impulsivity [100] and compulsivity [101]. Although we did not find that more model-free or less model-based behavior was linked to stronger obsessions and compulsions, we did find an association with stronger depressive symptoms when patients made more model-free and less model-based choices.

Confirming our hypothesis, schizophrenia patients in our study made largely random choices, which was especially apparent in rewarded common transitions. This is partially in contrast to earlier findings by Culbreth and colleagues [63] showing that chronic schizophrenia patients were impaired in model-based behavior, but employed model-free decision-making in the same task, and to findings by Waltz and colleagues [102], who reported that schizophrenia patients showed alterations in goal directed explorations but not random exploration, whereas more simple probabilistic learning tasks have consistently shown increased randomness in decision-making [38,55]. The Bayesian computational parameters in the present analysis clearly showed increased random exploration through decreased impact of preceding rewards (i.e., increased choice randomness) and more choice switches (i.e., reduced perseverance), which is very similar to the behavior seen in OCD patients within this study. Interestingly, it seems that the schizophrenia patients in our sample were particularly insensitive to the outcome of their choices, causing a disruption of model-free decision-making strategies. The insensitivity to reward has been shown across all stages of schizophrenia and has been associated with negative symptoms, especially anhedonia, and cognitive deficits [55,61,103,104]. Thus, our findings are in line with previous literature elucidating that these patients generally possess an impairment in reward anticipation and effort-based decision-making [8,61]. Completely random choice behavior on the two-step task might be a useful indicator for schizophrenia patients in remission of positive symptoms, however, this requires further exploration. Again, this is supported by the correlations we found across all patients, showing the more model-free and less model-based behavior is linked to more depressive symptoms and higher anhedonia.

Despite some differences across the groups, the results seem to converge in showing that higher reward effect or sensitivity, as indicated by less randomness and more model-based decision-making, are associated with a reduction of symptoms, especially anhedonia and depressive symptoms. This is in line with the previous literature suggesting impaired reward processing is associated with such symptoms across different psychiatric disorders [56,61,105–109]. This is an important finding of this transdiagnostic study, as anhedonia and depressive symptoms occur in all three disorders, which therefore seems to indicate a shared behavioral mechanism which underlies these symptoms. This provides a potential starting point for a behavioral intervention in order to reduce anhedonia and depressive symptoms.

Limitations

Whereas previous studies were able to elicit both model-based and model-free behavior with the original set up [41,59,69], using the standard two-step decision-making paradigm, we were unable to induce model-based behavior even in healthy controls. This might be due to limitations in instructions and the distributions of rewards using Gaussian-randomized reward probabilities. Especially the latter, may be

the reason for the worse performance of all participants at the end of the task. Furthermore, Akam and colleagues [110] and Da Silva and Hare [111] were both able to induce model-based behavior changing reward distribution and paradigm instructions, respectively. Future studies should, therefore, implement the changes suggested by Akam and Da Silva and Hare for more optimal performances.

The results of the Bayesian model elicited fewer and sometimes contradictive correlations with symptoms. One reason may be that we fitted the model under one hierarchical prior across all subjects independent of group which allows comparability between groups, which is necessary to understand distinct and shared associations but also reduces the informativeness of individual parameters. Previous work [55,112] indicated clear differences in the parameters when using group specific vs. group general priors. The rational however for fitting the model across all participants is that this would allow us to investigate the most robust, albeit very conservative, model. We would therefore assume that effects identified with this approach are reliable. Future hierarchical models should, nevertheless, be informed by the numbers of groups fitted within the model, in order to improve the sensitivity to potential systematic group differences.

None of the analyses has been controlled for medication. As we are using a transdiagnostic sample, we were unable to calculate general equivalent doses combining medication for different symptoms and disorders.

Furthermore, the correlations are not adjusted for multiple comparisons, given the exploratory nature of the analysis and the small sample sizes. Any significant findings will necessitate validation in subsequent studies.

This study only tested one decision-making paradigm, a broader set of paradigms would further increase the significance of the findings, and allow a more fine-grained investigation of mechanisms underlying shared symptoms.

Conclusion

Taken together, this study revealed that while all groups performed more model-free choices, there were differences in learning rates and how random choices were made. Importantly, the results indicated that more model-free behavior was linked to an increase in depressive symptoms and more model-based behavior was associated with lower levels of anhedonia across all patients. Thus, this study highlights important general and specific decision-making alterations in individuals with MDD, OCD and

schizophrenia and that co-occurring alterations and symptoms potentially share underlying behavioral mechanisms.

Acknowledgements

We thank all participants for their time and dedication.

Conflicts of interest

None of the authors reported any conflict of interest.

References

1. Endrass, T., & Ullsperger, M. (2021). Decision-making as transdiagnostic construct for mental health research. *Neuron*, *109*(12), 1912–1914. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2021.05.035

2. Goschke, T. (2014). Dysfunctions of decision-making and cognitive control as transdiagnostic mechanisms of mental disorders: Advances, gaps, and needs in current research. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, *23*(S1), 41–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.1410

3. Gu, Y., Zhou, C., Yang, J., Zhang, Q., Zhu, G., Sun, L., Ge, M., & Wang, Y. (2020). A transdiagnostic comparison of affective decision-making in patients with schizophrenia, major depressive disorder, or bipolar disorder. *PsyCh Journal*, *9*(2), 199–209. https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.351

4. Cella, M., Dymond, S., & Cooper, A. (2010). Impaired flexible decision-making in major depressive disorder. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *124*(1), 207–210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2009.11.013

5. Hindmarch, T., Hotopf, M., & Owen, G. S. (2013). Depression and decision-making capacity for treatment or research: A systematic review. *BMC Medical Ethics*, *14*(1), 54. https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6939-14-54

6. Cavedini, P., Gorini, A., & Bellodi, L. (2006). Understanding Obsessive–Compulsive Disorder: Focus on Decision Making. *Neuropsychology Review*, *16*(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-006-9001-y

7. Grassi, G., Pallanti, S., Righi, L., Figee, M., Mantione, M., Denys, D., Piccagliani, D., Rossi, A., & Stratta, P. (2015). Think twice: Impulsivity and decision making in obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, *4*(4), 263–272. https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.4.2015.039

8. Kesby, J. P., Murray, G. K., & Knolle, F. (2021). Neural Circuitry of Salience and Reward Processing in Psychosis. *Biological Psychiatry Global Open Science*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsgos.2021.12.003

9. Saperia, S., Da Silva, S., Siddiqui, I., Agid, O., Daskalakis, Z. J., Ravindran, A., Voineskos, A. N., Zakzanis, K. K., Remington, G., & Foussias, G. (2019). Reward-driven decision-making impairments in schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research*, *206*, 277–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2018.11.004

10. Belzung, C., Willner, P., & Philippot, P. (2015). Depression: From psychopathology to pathophysiology. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, *30*, 24–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2014.08.013

11. Joormann, J., & Stanton, C. H. (2016). *Examining emotion regulation in depression: A review and future directions—ScienceDirect*. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0005796716301188

12. Krings, A., Heeren, A., Fontaine, P., & Blairy, S. (2020). Attentional biases in depression: Relation to disorder severity, rumination, and anhedonia. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, *100*, 152173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsych.2020.152173

13. Dolan, R. J. (2002). Emotion, Cognition, and Behavior. *Science*. https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.1076358

14. Huys, Q. J. M., Daw, N. D., & Dayan, P. (2015). Depression: A Decision-Theoretic Analysis. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *38*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-071714-033928

15. McFarland, B. R., & Klein, D. N. (2009). Emotional reactivity in depression: Diminished responsiveness to anticipated reward but not to anticipated punishment or to nonreward or avoidance. *Depression and Anxiety*, *26*(2), 117–122. https://doi.org/10.1002/da.20513

16. Sherdell, L., Waugh, C. E., & Gotlib, I. H. (2012). Anticipatory pleasure predicts motivation for reward in major depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *121*(1), 51–60. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024945

17. Culbreth, A. J., Moran, E. K., & Barch, D. M. (2018). Effort-cost decision-making in psychosis and depression: Could a similar behavioral deficit arise from disparate psychological and neural mechanisms? *Psychological Medicine*. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/psychological-medicine/article/abs/effortcost-decisionmaking-in-psychosis-and-depression-could-a-similar-behavioral-deficit-arise-from-disparate-psychological-and-neural-mechanisms/D6F322EA921BC99DDBB5E8BF419A2610

18. Moran, E. K., Prevost, C., Culbreth, A. J., & Barch, D. M. (2023). Effort-cost decision-making in psychotic and mood disorders. *Journal of Psychopathology and Clinical Science*, *132*(4), 490–498. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000822

19. Treadway, M. T., Bossaller, N. A., Shelton, R. C., & Zald, D. H. (2012). Effort-based decision-making in major depressive disorder: A translational model of motivational anhedonia. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *121*(3), 553–558. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028813

20. Beevers, C. G., Mullarkey, M. C., Dainer-Best, J., Stewart, R. A., Labrada, J., Allen, J. J. B., McGeary, J. E., & Shumake, J. (2019). Association between negative cognitive bias and depression: A symptom-level approach. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *128*(3), 212–227. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000405

21. Noworyta, K., Cieslik, A., & Rygula, R. (2021). Neuromolecular Underpinnings of Negative Cognitive Bias in Depression. *Cells*, *10*(11), Article 11. https://doi.org/10.3390/cells10113157

22. Ang, Y.-S., Gelda, S. E., & Pizzagalli, D. A. (2023). Cognitive effort-based decision-making in major depressive disorder. *Psychological Medicine*, *53*(9), 4228–4235. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291722000964

23. Chen, C., Takahashi, T., Nakagawa, S., Inoue, T., & Kusumi, I. (2015). Reinforcement learning in depression: A review of computational research. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *55*, 247–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.05.005

24. Kerestes, R., Davey, C. G., Stephanou, K., Whittle, S., & Harrison, B. J. (2014). Functional brain imaging studies of youth depression: A systematic review. *NeuroImage: Clinical*, *4*, 209–231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nicl.2013.11.009

25. Knutson, B., Bhanji, J. P., Cooney, R. E., Atlas, L. Y., & Gotlib, I. H. (2008). Neural Responses to Monetary Incentives in Major Depression. *Biological Psychiatry*, *63*(7), 686–692. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2007.07.023

26. Steele, J. D., Kumar, P., & Ebmeier, K. P. (2007). Blunted response to feedback information in depressive illness. *Brain*, *130*(9), 2367–2374. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awm150

27. Pizzagalli, D. A. (2014). Depression, Stress, and Anhedonia: Toward a Synthesis and Integrated Model. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *10*(1), 393–423. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185606

28. Ragland, J. D., Cools, R., Frank, M., Pizzagalli, D. A., Preston, A., Ranganath, C., & Wagner, A. D. (2009). CNTRICS Final Task Selection: Long-Term Memory. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *35*(1), 197–212. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbn134

29. Benzina, N., Mallet, L., Burguière, E., N'Diaye, K., & Pelissolo, A. (2016). Cognitive Dysfunction in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *18*(9), 80. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-016-0720-3

30. Gillan, C. M., & Robbins, T. W. (2014). Goal-directed learning and obsessive–compulsive disorder. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *369*(1655), 20130475. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0475

31. Gillan, C. M., Papmeyer, M., Morein-Zamir, S., Sahakian, B. J., Fineberg, N. A., Robbins, T. W., & de Wit, S. (2011). Disruption in the Balance Between Goal-Directed Behavior and Habit Learning in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *168*(7), 718–726. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2011.10071062

32. Grosskurth, E. D., Bach, D. R., Economides, M., Huys, Q. J. M., & Holper, L. (2019). No substantial change in the balance between model-free and model-based control via training on the two-step task. *PLOS Computational Biology*, *15*(11), e1007443. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007443

33. Gillan, C. M. (2017). *Habits and goals in OCD*.

34. Nestadt, G., Kamath, V., Maher, B. S., Krasnow, J., Nestadt, P., Wang, Y., Bakker, A., & Samuels, J. (2016). Doubt and the Decision-making Process in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Medical Hypotheses*, *96*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2016.09.010

35. Robbins, T. W. (2022). *Cognitive flexibility, OCD and the brain*. *145*(3), 814–815.

36. Suhas, S., & Rao, N. P. (2019). Neurocognitive deficits in obsessive–compulsive disorder: A selective review. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, *61*(Suppl 1), S30–S36. https://doi.org/10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_517_18

37. Murray, G. K., Knolle, F., Ersche, K. D., Craig, K. J., Abbott, S., Shabbir, S. S., Fineberg, N. A., Suckling, J., Sahakian, B. J., Bullmore, E. T., & Robbins, T. W. (2019). Dopaminergic drug treatment remediates exaggerated cingulate prediction error responses in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Psychopharmacology*, *236*(8), 2325–2336. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-019-05292-2

38. Ermakova, A. O., Knolle, F., Justicia, A., Bullmore, E. T., Jones, P. B., Robbins, T. W., Fletcher, P. C., & Murray, G. K. (2018). Abnormal reward prediction-error signalling in antipsychotic naive individuals with first-episode psychosis or clinical risk for psychosis. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *43*(8), Article 8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-018-0056-2

39. Katthagen, T., Kaminski, J., Heinz, A., Buchert, R., & Schlagenhauf, F. (2020). Striatal Dopamine and Reward Prediction Error Signaling in Unmedicated Schizophrenia Patients. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *46*(6), 1535–1546. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbaa055

40. Yaple, Z. A., Tolomeo, S., & Yu, R. (2021). Abnormal prediction error processing in schizophrenia and depression. *Human Brain Mapping*, *42*(11), 3547–3560. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.25453

41. Voon, V., Baek, K., Enander, J., Worbe, Y., Morris, L. S., Harrison, N. A., Robbins, T. W., Rück, C., & Daw, N. (2015). Motivation and value influences in the relative balance of goal-directed and habitual behaviours in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *Translational Psychiatry*, *5*(11), Article 11. https://doi.org/10.1038/tp.2015.165

42. Adinoff, B., Devous, M. D., Cooper, D. B., Best, S. E., Chandler, P., Harris, T., Cervin, C. A., & Cullum, C. M. (2003). Resting regional cerebral blood flow and gambling task performance in cocaine-dependent subjects and healthy comparison subjects. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *160*(10), 1892–1894. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.160.10.1892

43. Baxter, L. R., Phelps, M. E., Mazziotta, J. C., Guze, B. H., Schwartz, J. M., & Selin, C. E. (1987). Local cerebral glucose metabolic rates in obsessive-compulsive disorder. A comparison with rates in unipolar depression and in normal controls. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *44*(3), 211–218. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1987.01800150017003

44. Perani, D., Colombo, C., Bressi, S., Bonfanti, A., Grassi, F., Scarone, S., Bellodi, L., Smeraldi, E., & Fazio, F. (1995). [18F]FDG PET study in obsessive-compulsive disorder. A clinical/metabolic correlation study after treatment. *The British Journal of Psychiatry: The Journal of Mental Science*, *166*(2), 244–250. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.166.2.244

45. Saxena, S., Brody, A. L., Schwartz, J. M., & Baxter, L. R. (1998). Neuroimaging and frontal-subcortical circuitry in obsessive-compulsive disorder. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *173*(S35), 26–37. https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125000297870

46. Sterzer, P., Voss, M., Schlagenhauf, F., & Heinz, A. (2019). Decision-making in schizophrenia: A predictive-coding perspective. *NeuroImage*, *190*, 133–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.05.074

47. Dudley, R., Taylor, P., Wickham, S., & Hutton, P. (2015). *Psychosis, Delusions and the "Jumping to Conclusions" Reasoning Bias: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis | Schizophrenia Bulletin | Oxford Academic*. https://academic.oup.com/schizophreniabulletin/article/42/3/652/2413859

48. Ermakova, A. O., Gileadi, N., Knolle, F., Justicia, A., Anderson, R., Fletcher, P. C., Moutoussis, M., & Murray, G. K. (2019). Cost Evaluation During Decision-Making in Patients at Early Stages of Psychosis. *Computational Psychiatry (Cambridge, Mass.)*, *3*, 18–39. https://doi.org/10.1162/cpsy_a_00020

49. Evans, S. L., Averbeck, B. B., & Furl, N. (2015). Jumping to conclusions in schizophrenia. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, *11*, 1615–1624. https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S56870

50. Leroy, A., Amad, A., D'Hondt, F., Pins, D., Jaafari, N., Thomas, P., & Jardri, R. (2020). Reward anticipation in schizophrenia: A coordinate-based meta-analysis. *Schizophrenia Research*, *218*, 2–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2019.12.041

51. Murray, G. K., Clark, L., Corlett, P. R., Blackwell, A. D., Cools, R., Jones, P. B., Robbins, T. W., & Poustka, L. (2008). Incentive motivation in first-episode psychosis: A behavioural study. *BMC Psychiatry*, *8*(1), 34. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-8-34

52. Radua, J., Schmidt, A., Borgwardt, S., Heinz, A., Schlagenhauf, F., McGuire, P., & Fusar-Poli, P. (2015). Ventral Striatal Activation During Reward Processing in Psychosis: A Neurofunctional Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *72*(12), 1243–1251. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.2196

53. Cella, M., Bishara, A. J., Medin, E., Swan, S., Reeder, C., & Wykes, T. (2014). Identifying Cognitive Remediation Change Through Computational Modelling—Effects on Reinforcement Learning in Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *40*(6), 1422–1432.

54. Cheng, G. L. F., Tang, J. C. Y., Li, F. W. S., Lau, E. Y. Y., & Lee, T. M. C. (2012). Schizophrenia and risk-taking: Impaired reward but preserved punishment processing. *Schizophrenia Research*, *136*(1–3), 122–127.

55. Montagnese, M., Knolle, F., Haarsma, J., Griffin, J. D., Richards, A., Vertes, P. E., Kiddle, B., Fletcher, P. C., Jones, P. B., Owen, M. J., Fonagy, P., Bullmore, E. T., Dolan, R. J., Moutoussis, M., Goodyer, I. M., & Murray, G. K. (2020). Reinforcement learning as an intermediate phenotype in psychosis? Deficits sensitive to illness stage but not associated with polygenic risk of schizophrenia in the general population. *Schizophrenia Research*, *222*, 389–396. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2020.04.022

56. Deserno, L., Heinz, A., & Schlagenhauf, F. (2017). Computational approaches to schizophrenia: A perspective on negative symptoms. *Schizophrenia Research*, *186*, 46–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.10.004

57. Gold, J. M., Waltz, J. A., Prentice, K. J., Morris, S. E., & Heerey, E. A. (2008). Reward Processing in Schizophrenia: A Deficit in the Representation of Value. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *34*(5), 835–847. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbn068

58. Heinz, A., & Schlagenhauf, F. (2010). Dopaminergic Dysfunction in Schizophrenia: Salience Attribution Revisited. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *36*(3), 472–485. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbq031

59. Brandl, F., Knolle, F., Avram, M., Leucht, C., Yakushev, I., Priller, J., Leucht, S., Ziegler, S., Wunderlich, K., & Sorg, C. (2022). Negative symptoms, striatal dopamine, and model-free reward decision-making in schizophrenia. *Brain*, awac268. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awac268

60. Culbreth, A. J., Moran, E. K., & Barch, D. M. (2018). Effort-based decision-making in schizophrenia. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *22*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2017.12.003

61. Gold, J. M., Strauss, G. P., Waltz, J. A., Robinson, B. M., Brown, J. K., & Frank, M. J. (2013). Negative Symptoms of Schizophrenia Are Associated with Abnormal Effort-Cost Computations. *Biological Psychiatry*, *74*(2), 130–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.12.022

62. McCarthy, J. M., Treadway, M. T., Bennett, M. E., & Blanchard, J. J. (2016). Inefficient effort allocation and negative symptoms in individuals with schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Research*, *170*(2), 278–284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2015.12.017

63. Culbreth, A. J., Westbrook, A., Daw, N. D., Botvinick, M., & Barch, D. M. (2016). Reduced model-based decision-making in schizophrenia. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *125*(6), 777–787. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000164

64. Bishop, S. J., & Gagne, C. (2018). Anxiety, Depression, and Decision Making: A Computational Perspective. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *41*, 371–388.

65. Gruner, P., Anticevic, A., Lee, D., & Pittenger, C. (2016). Arbitration between Action Strategies in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *The Neuroscientist*, *22*(2), 188–198.

66. Hauser, T. U., Moutoussis, M., Iannarone, R., Brem, S., Walitza, S., Drechsler, R., Dayan, P., & Dolan, R. J. (2017). Increased decision thresholds enhance information gathering performance in juvenile Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD). *PLOS Computational Biology*, *13*(4). https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005440

67. Heller, A. S., Ezie, C. E. C., Otto, A. R., & Timpano, K. R. (2018). Model-based learning and individual differences in depression: The moderating role of stress. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *111*, 19–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2018.09.007

68. Palzett, E. H., Kool, W., Millner, A. J., & Gershman, S. J. (2019). Incentives Boost Model-Based Control Across a Range of Severity on Several Psychiatric Constructs. *Biological Psychiatry*, *85*(5), 425–433.

69. Daw, N. D., Gershman, S. J., Seymour, B., Dayan, P., & Dolan, R. J. (2011). Model-Based Influences on Humans' Choices and Striatal Prediction Errors. *Neuron*, *69*(6), 1204–1215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2011.02.027

70. First, M., Spitzer, R., Gibbon, M., & Williams, J. (2002). *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV-TR Axis I Disorders, Research Version, Patient Edition (SCID-I/P)*. Biometrics Research, New York State Psychiatric Institute: New York.

71. Andreasen, N. C., Carpenter, W. T., Kane, J. M., Lasser, R. A., Marder, S. R., & Weinberger, D. R. (2005). Remission in Schizophrenia: Proposed Criteria and Rationale for Consensus. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *162*(3), 441–449. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.162.3.441

72. Hamilton, M. (1967). Development of a Rating Scale for Primary Depressive Illness. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *6*(4), 278–296. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1967.tb00530.x

73. Kay, S. R., Fiszbein, A., & Opler, L. A. (1987). The Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) for Schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *13*(2), 261–276. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/13.2.261

74. Goodman, W. K., Price, L. H., Rasmussen, S. A., Mazure, C., Fleischmann, R. L., Hill, C. L., Heninger, G. R., & Charney, D. S. (1989). The Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale: I. Development, Use, and Reliability. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *46*(11), 1006–1011. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1989.01810110048007

75. Foa, E. B., Huppert, J. D., Leiberg, S., Langner, R., Kichic, R., Hajcak, G., & Salkovskis, P. M. (2002). The Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory: Development and validation of a short version. *Psychological Assessment*, *14*(4), 485–496. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.14.4.485

76. Chapman, L. J., Chapman, J. P., & Raulin, M. L. (1976). Scales for physical and social anhedonia. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *85*(4), 374–382. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.85.4.374

77. Keefe, R. S. E., Goldberg, T. E., Harvey, P. D., Gold, J. M., Poe, M. P., & Coughenour, L. (2004). The Brief Assessment of Cognition in Schizophrenia: Reliability, sensitivity, and comparison with a standard neurocognitive battery. *Schizophrenia Research*, *68*(2–3), 283–297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2003.09.011

78. Ahn, W.-Y., Haines, N., & Zhang, L. (2017). Revealing Neurocomputational Mechanisms of Reinforcement Learning and Decision-Making With the hBayesDM Package. *Computational Psychiatry (Cambridge, Mass.)*, *1*, 24–57. https://doi.org/10.1162/CPSY_a_00002

79. Stan Development Team. (2018). *RStan: The R interface to Stan*. https://mc-stan.org/

80. Wunderlich, K., Smittenaar, P., & Dolan, R. J. (2012). Dopamine Enhances Model-Based over Model-Free Choice Behavior. *Neuron*, *75*(3), 418–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2012.03.042

81. R Core Team. (2021). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/

82. Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York. https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

83. Kassambara, A. (2020). *ggpubr: 'ggplot2' Based Publication Ready Plots*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr

84. Jr, F. E. H., Dupont, with contributions from C., & others, many. (2021). *Hmisc: Harrell Miscellaneous*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc

85. Singmann, H., Bolker, B., Westfall, J., Aust, F., & Ben-Shachar, M. S. (2021). *afex: Analysis of Factorial Experiments*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=afex

86. Mair, P., & Wilcox, R. (2019). Robust statistical methods in R using the WRS2 package. *Behaviour Research Methods*, *52*, 464–488.

87. Kassambara, A. (2019). *ggcorrplot: Visualization of a Correlation Matrix using 'ggplot2'*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggcorrplot

88. Kim, S. (2015). *ppcor: Partial and Semi-Partial (Part) Correlation*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ppcor

89. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using {lme4}. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*(1), 1–48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01

90. Blanco, N. J., Otto, A. R., Maddox, W. T., Beevers, C. G., & Love, B. C. (2013). The influence of depression symptoms on exploratory decision-making. *Cognition*, *129*(3), 563–568. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2013.08.018

91. Farabaugh, A. H., Mischoulon, D., Fava, M., Green, C., Guyker, W., & Alpert, J. (2004). The potential relationship between levels of perceived stress and subtypes of major depressive disorder (MDD). *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *110*(6), 465–470. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0447.2004.00377.x

92. Richter-Levin, G., & Xu, L. (2018). How could stress lead to major depressive disorder? *IBRO Reports*, *4*, 38–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibror.2018.04.001

93. Vinkers, C. H., Joëls, M., Milaneschi, Y., Kahn, R. S., Penninx, B. W. J. H., & Boks, M. P. M. (2014). Stress Exposure Across the Life Span Cumulatively Increases Depression Risk and Is Moderated by Neuroticism. *Depression and Anxiety*, *31*(9), 737–745. https://doi.org/10.1002/da.22262

94. Soder, H. E., Cooper, J. A., Lopez-Gamundi, P., Hoots, J. K., Nunez, C., Lawlor, V. M., Lane, S. D., Treadway, M. T., & Wardle, M. C. (2021). Dose-response effects of d-amphetamine on effort-based decision-making and reinforcement learning. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *46*(6), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-020-0779-8

95. Rocha, F. F. da, Alvarenga, N. B., Malloy-Diniz, L., & Corrêa, H. (2011). Decision-making impairment in obsessive-compulsive disorder as measured by the Iowa Gambling Task. *Arquivos de Neuro-Psiquiatria*, *69*, 642–647. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0004-282X2011000500013

96. Chamberlain, S. R., Menzies, L., Hampshire, A., Suckling, J., Fineberg, N. A., del Campo, N., Aitken, M., Craig, K., Owen, A. M., Bullmore, E. T., Robbins, T. W., & Sahakian, B. J. (2008). Orbitofrontal Dysfunction in Patients with Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder and Their Unaffected Relatives. *Science*, *321*(5887), 421–422. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1154433

97. Remijnse, P. L., Nielen, M. M. A., van Balkom, A. J. L. M., Cath, D. C., van Oppen, P., Uylings, H. B. M., & Veltman, D. J. (2006). Reduced Orbitofrontal-Striatal Activity on a Reversal Learning Task in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *63*(11), 1225–1236. https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.63.11.1225

98. Chamberlain, S. R., Solly, J. E., Hook, R. W., Vaghi, M. M., & Robbins, T. W. (2021). Cognitive Inflexibility in OCD and Related Disorders. In N. A. Fineberg & T. W.

Robbins (Eds.), *The Neurobiology and Treatment of OCD: Accelerating Progress* (pp. 125–145). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/7854_2020_198

99. Rosa-Alcázar, A. I., Rosa-Alcázar, Á., Martínez-Esparza, I. C., Storch, E. A., & Olivares-Olivares, P. J. (2021). Response Inhibition, Cognitive Flexibility and Working Memory in Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder, Generalized Anxiety Disorder and Social Anxiety Disorder. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(7), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18073642

100. Dubois, M., & Hauser, T. U. (2022). Value-free random exploration is linked to impulsivity. *Nature Communications*, *13*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-31918-9

101. Lee, J. K., Rouault, M., & Wyart, V. (2023). *Compulsivity is linked to maladaptive choice variability but unaltered reinforcement learning under uncertainty* (p. 2023.01.05.522867). bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.01.05.522867

102. Waltz, J. A., Wilson, R. C., Albrecht, M. A., Frank, M. J., & Gold, J. M. (2020). Differential Effects of Psychotic Illness on Directed and Random Exploration. *Computational Psychiatry (Cambridge, Mass.)*, *4*, 18–39. https://doi.org/10.1162/cpsy_a_00027

103. Barch, D. M., Treadway, M. T., & Schoen, N. (2014). Effort, anhedonia, and function in schizophrenia: Reduced effort allocation predicts amotivation and functional impairment. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *123*(2), 387–397. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036299

104. Saleh, Y., Jarratt-Barnham, I., Petitet, P., Fernandez-Egea, E., Manohar, S. G., & Husain, M. (2023). Negative symptoms and cognitive impairment are associated with distinct motivational deficits in treatment resistant schizophrenia. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-023-02232-7

105. Coccurello, R. (2019). Anhedonia in depression symptomatology: Appetite dysregulation and defective brain reward processing. *Behavioural Brain Research*, *372*, 112041. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2019.112041

106. Fan, J., Han, Y., Xia, J., Wang, X., Liu, Q., Liu, Y., Lu, J., Yu, Q., Yang, Y., & Zhu, X. (2023). Childhood Neglect rather than Abuse Is More Strongly Associated with Anhedonia across Major Depression and Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder Patients and University Students. *Depression and Anxiety*, *2023*, e2429889. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/2429889

107. Oh, H., Lee, J., Patriquin, M. A., Oldham, J., & Salas, R. (2023). Reward Processing in Psychiatric Inpatients With Depression. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, *8*(7), 731–740. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2021.05.010

108. Slaney, C., Perkins, A. M., Davis, R., Penton-Voak, I., Munafò, M. R., Houghton, C. J., & Robinson, E. S. J. (2023). Objective measures of reward sensitivity and motivation in people with high v. Low anhedonia. *Psychological Medicine*, *53*(10), 4324–4332. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291722001052

109. Stringaris, A., Vidal-Ribas Belil, P., Artiges, E., Lemaitre, H., Gollier-Briant, F., Wolke, S., Vulser, H., Miranda, R., Penttilä, J., Struve, M., Fadai, T., Kappel, V., Grimmer, Y., Goodman, R., Poustka, L., Conrod, P., Cattrell, A., Banaschewski, T., Bokde, A. L. W., … IMAGEN Consortium. (2015). The Brain's Response to Reward Anticipation and Depression in Adolescence: Dimensionality, Specificity, and Longitudinal Predictions in a Community-Based Sample. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *172*(12), 1215–1223. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2015.14101298

110. Akam, T., Costa, R., & Dayan, P. (2015). Simple Plans or Sophisticated Habits? State, Transition and Learning Interactions in the Two-Step Task. *PLOS Computational Biology*, *11*(12), e1004648. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004648

111. Feher da Silva, C., & Hare, T. A. (2020). Humans primarily use model-based inference in the two-stage task. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *4*(10), Article 10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0905-y

112. Knolle, F., Sterner, E., Moutoussis, M., Adams, R. A., Griffin, J. D., Haarsma, J., Taverne, H., Goodyer, I. M., Fletcher, P. C., & Murray, G. K. (2022). *Action selection in early stages of psychosis: An active inference approach | medRxiv*. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.05.11.22274896v1

Figure legends

Figure 1

Two-step Markov decision task. Showing the state transition structure which allows discrimination between model-based and model-free behavior. Note: All stimuli in stage 2 are associated with a probabilistic reward changing slowly and independently based on Gaussian random walks, forcing subjects to continuously learn and explore the second stage choices.

Figure 2

Ideal and actual stay probabilities. Note: (a) Ideal, simulated model-based decision-making behavior: Model-free reinforcement learning predicts that a first-stage choice yielding a reward is likely to be repeated on the upcoming trial, regardless of a common or an uncommon transition; Ideal model-based decision-making behavior: Model-based reinforcement learning predicts that an uncommon transition should affect the value of the next first stage option, leading to a predicted interaction between reward and transition probability; (b) Rewarded trials, independent of transition show higher stay probabilities across healthy controls, MDD and OCD suggesting increased model-free behavior; the plot slightly displays an influence of both strategies in MDD; and random choice behavior in in schizophrenia (SCZ) patients.

Figure 3

Correlations between model-free and model-based behavior and clinical scores across all groups. (a) reward beta estimate from the logistic regression and HAMD (b) reward x transition interaction beta estimate from the logistic regression and Anhedonia total (c) Perseverance (π) from the computational model and HAMD (d) Model-weights (ω) from the computational model and Anhedonia – Total.

Figure 4

Group differences in model-parameters. Note: (a) Learning rate stage 1 (α-1); (b) Inverse temperature stage 2 (β-1); (c) Learning rate stage 1 (α-1); (d) Inverse temperature stage 2 (β-2); (e) Perseverance (π); (f) Model-weights (ω); Group differences are calculated with robust post-hoc tests based on trimmed means using bootsrapping method *: significant differences at $p<0.05$; **: significant differences at $p<0.01$; ***: significant differences at $p<0.001$; ; ****: significant differences at $p<0.0001$; p-values are adjusted using Bonferroni correction. The individual box plots represent the minimum, maximum, median, first quartile and third quartile and the outliers in the data set.