medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Anxiety symptoms of major depression associated with increased willingness to exert cognitive, but not physical effort

Laura A. Bustamante[1,2] Deanna M. Barch [1] Johanne Solis[3]
Temitope Oshinowo[2] Ivan Grahek [4] Anna B. Konova[3]
Nathaniel D. Daw[2] Jonathan D. Cohen [2]

[1]Washington University in St. Louis
[2]Princeton University
[3]Rutgers University
[4]Brown University
bustamante@wustl.edu

Keywords major depressive disorder; effort-based decision making; anxiety; anhedonia; cognitive control; physical effort

Abstract

Background Individuals with major depressive disorder (MDD) can experience reduced motivation and cognitive function, leading to challenges with goal-directed behavior. When selecting goals, people maximize 'expected value' by selecting actions that maximize potential reward while minimizing associated costs, including effort 'costs' and the opportunity cost of time. In MDD, differential weighing of costs and benefits are theorized mechanisms underlying changes in goal-directed cognition and may contribute to symptom heterogeneity.

Methods We used the Effort Foraging Task to quantify cognitive and physical effort costs, and patch leaving thresholds in low effort conditions (hypothesized to reflect perceived opportunity cost of time) and investigated their shared versus distinct relationships to clinical features in participants with MDD (N=52) and comparisons (N=27).

Results Contrary to our predictions, none of the decision-making measures differed with MDD diagnosis. However, each of the measures were related to symptom severity, over and above effects of ability (i.e., performance). Greater anxiety symptoms were selectively associated with *lower* cognitive effort cost (i.e. greater willingness to exert effort). Greater anhedonia symptoms were associated with increased physical effort costs. Finally, greater physical anergia was related to decreased patch leaving thresholds.

Conclusions Markers of effort-based decision-making may inform understanding of MDD heterogeneity. Increased willingness to exert cognitive effort may contribute to anxiety symptoms such as rumination and worry. association of decreased leaving thresholds with symptom severity is consistent with reward rate-based accounts of reduced vigor in MDD. Future research should address subtypes of depression with or without anxiety, which may relate differentially to cognitive effort decisions.

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/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Goal-directed behavior in major depressive disorder (MDD)

Individuals with major depressive disorder (MDD) can experience challenges with goal-directed behavior, including reduced motivation due to symptoms such as apathy, anergia, and anhedonia, and reduced cognitive function. Decisions about which goals to pursue, and which actions to take to achieve them, can be understood in terms of costs and benefits. People maximize 'expected value' by selecting actions that maximize potential reward while minimizing associated costs. Effort-based decision-making involves minimizing cognitive and physical effort costs (Rigoux & Guigon, 2012; Salamone et al., 2018; Shenhav et al., 2013; Shenhav et al., 2017; Walton et al., 2007) as well as the opportunity cost of time (often also emphasized in value-based decision-making Constantino & Daw, 2015).

Under effort- and value-based decision-making disruption accounts of MDD symptoms, changes in goal-directed behavior in depression can come from multiple causes, for example differences in representing either the benefits or the costs of potential actions. The present study focuses on cognitive and physical effort costs, as well as opportunity costs (i.e., reward rate), to understand how differences in components of goal-directed behavior relate to clinical features of MDD.

Both cognitive and physical effort-based decision-making have been reported to differ in MDD, though findings have been mixed. MDD has been associated with decreased willingness to exert cognitive effort relative to comparison groups in some studies (Ang et al., 2023; Vinckier et al., 2022; Westbrook et al., 2022) though not in others (Barch et al., 2023; Tran et al., 2021). Willingness to exert physical effort has been found to be decreased in MDD relative to comparison groups in some studies (Berwian et al., 2020; Cléry-Melin et al., 2011; Treadway et al., 2012; Vinckier et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; X.-H. Yang et al., 2014; Zou et al., 2020) though not in others (Cathomas et al., 2021; Sherdell et al., 2012; Tran et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022; X. Yang et al., 2021).

Dissociating between cognitive and physical effort costs

Taken together, both cognitive and physical effort decision-making appear to be associated with features of MDD, and may underlie certain MDD symptoms, though findings have been mixed. Importantly, MDD is highly heterogeneous both in terms of variation in symptom domains and symptom severity across individuals, which may contribute to inconsistent findings with respect to diagnostic group differences and associations with clinical features of MDD. MDD presentation encompasses many different symptoms, and decision-making mechanisms have many different components (including reward sensitivity, effort costs, task ability). Gaining traction on mechanistically informed treatments will require precise computational measures on the decision-making side, to tease apart their specific relation to precise measures of MDD symptoms.

Initial studies measuring both effort types within-participants found differential relationships of cognitive and physical effort decisions to symptoms (Tran et al., 2021; Vinckier et al., 2022), suggesting these may be useful in characterizing heterogeneity in MDD symptoms. Studies measuring each effort type separately have reported decreased willingness to exert physical effort associated with symptom severity (Sherdell et al., 2012; Tran et al., 2021; X.-H. Yang et al., 2014, i.e., anhedonia), while others reported no relationship to symptom severity (e.g., not related to depression, anhedonia, apathy, Ang et al., 2023; Barch et al., 2023; Hershenberg et al., 2016; Vinckier et al., 2022). For cognitive effort, some studies report associations with symptom severity (i.e., global functioning, Tran et al., 2021; Westbrook et al., 2022) while others do not (e.g., not related to depression, anhedonia, apathy, Ang et al., 2023; Barch et al., 2023; Hershenberg et al., 2016; Vinckier et al., 2022). It remains unclear which symptoms map onto which component decision processes, and how shared or distinct these mappings are between cognitive and physical effort.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Hypothesized symptom relationships

Multiple symptom domains of MDD have been proposed to relate to value- and effort-based decision-making. Subjective reward rate, reflecting the opportunity cost of time, is proposed to drive the vigor of actions (and represented via midbrain dopamine tone Niv et al., 2007). Drawing on this insight, Huys, Daw, and Dayan (2015) proposed that physical anergia and psychomotor slowing symptoms of depression may be caused by reduced subjective reward rate representations. Relatedly, reduced willingness to exert physical effort to obtain rewards has proposed as a mechanism underlying anhedonia and apathy symptoms of depression (Cooper et al., 2018; Husain & Roiser, 2018; Pessiglione et al., 2018). Grahek and colleagues (2019) proposed that changes in motivational processes resulting in reduced willingness to exert cognitive effort, may underlie, in part, reduced cognitive function associated with MDD, challenging the standard assumption that reduced cognitive function reflects reduced cognitive control capacity (Millan et al., 2012; Rock et al., 2014; Snyder, 2013). This is of particular importance because reduced cognitive function in MDD contributes to disability (Jaeger et al., 2006) and is often not improved with otherwise effective anti-depressant treatments (Halahakoon & Roiser, 2016; Rosenblat et al., 2016). By the cognitive effort-based decision-making account, interventions to improve cognitive function would focus on boosting motivation and target willingness to engage control, rather than cognitive control ability (e.g., computerized cognitive training) as suggested by the reduced capacity account.

The variable prevalence of these symptoms across studies may contribute to mixed findings. For example, reduced motivation may be minimal or absent in some individuals with MDD (Ang et al., 2017; Nakonezny et al., 2010). In addition, certain symptom domains of depression may show a differential relationship to effort relative to others. Anxiety (the most common MDD comorbidity, Kessler et al., 1996) symptoms such as rumination and worry may require cognitive effort (e.g., sampling for replay and planning, Bedder et al., 2023), and anxiety has been related to increased effortful model-based planning (Gillan et al., 2016). Anxiety has also been linked to increased cognitive effort exertion to maintain performance in the face of increased attentional demands posed by threat-related stimuli (Eysenck et al., 2007). Additionally, social anxiety may be associated with enhanced motivation to exert cognitive effort in social contexts (such as a psychology experiment, Hunter et al., 2018). It therefore may be important to account for anxiety heterogeneity and relate cognitive effort-based decision making to specific depression symptom expression profiles (or subtypes), as some have suggested (Gagne et al., 2020; Lynch et al., 2020).

Experiment overview

The goal of the current study was to quantify multiple components of effort-based decision-making and decompose their contributions to MDD symptom expression profiles. Each component measured (i.e., cognitive and physical effort cost, cognitive task ability, subjective reward rate) has been proposed as a mechanism underlying specific MDD symptoms. To test each of these accounts, we had participants who met diagnostic criteria for MDD and demographically matched comparison participants with no psychiatric diagnoses complete cognitive and physical versions of the Effort Foraging Task (Bustamante et al., 2023). We used the Effort Foraging Task to minimize demand characteristics (that cue participants to the purpose of the study, Orne, 1962) by measuring effort avoidance indirectly based on the effect of effort on foraging behavior. Most previous studies on MDD used explicit tasks in which participants choose between low effort/low reward and high effort/high reward options, such that decisions may be influenced by demand characteristics. This may also contribute to mixed findings across the literature.

In the Effort Foraging Task, participants choose between harvesting a depleting patch, or traveling to a new patch, which is costly in time and effort. The longer a participant delays leaving the patch in the high versus low effort condition the larger their inferred effort cost. The focus of analyses is on 'exit thresholds', the expected reward on the next harvest on a trial that the participants chose to leave the patch. According to the Marginal Value Theorem (Charnov, 1976, MVT), participants should com-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

pare the expected reward on the next harvest against the reward rate in the local block and exit when the expected reward falls below the average. Based on this patch leaving behavior, a foraging-theory based computational model quantifies individual differences in the 'cost' of cognitive and physical effort (reflecting the change in exit threshold from low to high effort conditions). Task behavior can also be used to assess overall foraging strategy (overall exit thresholds). According to the MVT, exit thresholds should reflect average reward rate representations, and this account is consistent with human patch foraging behavior (Constantino et al., 2017; Constantino & Daw, 2015; Lenow et al., 2017). Lastly, we assessed effortful travel task ability using accuracy and reaction times. We aimed to tease apart the influences of each of these effort decision-making components on clinical features of MDD by examining i) diagnostic group differences, ii) associations with overall depression severity (using the Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression total score), and iii) associations with symptom severity.

Based on previous findings, and theory work we predicted cognitive effort costs would be increased in the MDD group and related to increased cognitive function symptoms (i.e., subjective cognitive complaints relative to baseline, Grahek et al., 2018; Grahek et al., 2019). Based on previous findings with direct choice tasks we predicted physical effort cost would be increased in the MDD group and related to increased anhedonia (Sherdell et al., 2012; Tran et al., 2021; X.-H. Yang et al., 2014). Following Huys et al. 2015 we hypothesized that the MDD group would differ in foraging strategy, exhibiting lower exit thresholds overall, and that this would relate to increased physical anergia/slowing.

Methods and Materials

Study overview

Participants

97 participants volunteered for the study and gave informed consent as approved by the Institutional Review Board of Rutgers University (67 MDD, mean=26.9 years, SD=11.1, 18-61 years; 30 comparison mean=27.1 years, SD=9.64, 19-59 years). All participants completed a detailed clinical assessment in session 1, but 7 MDD and 3 comparison participants opted not to return for the second (task) session. Therefore, the clinical symptom ratings and self-report analysis included data from the 60 MDD and 27 comparison participants who returned for the second session. 45 MDD participants were currently depressed (38 with task data), 12 MDD participants were partially remitted and 3 were remitted depressed (all with task data). To ensure remitted status was not driving any key effect we also report analyses excluding remitted participants. 32 MDD participants used psychoactive medication while 28 did not. Additional study details and inclusion and exclusion criteria are in SI section 1.1. We confirmed the groups were matched on key demographic variables (see SI section 1.1.2).

Clinician ratings and self-reports

The Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 (First, 2015, SCID-5), Overview, Mood, Psychotic, and Substance-Use Disorder modules were used to confirm assignment of MDD diagnosis in the MDD group (and absence of exclusionary diagnoses in both groups). We assessed depression symptom expression using the following measures: Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (Hamilton, 1960), Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (Overall & Gorham, 1962), Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (Fava et al., 2009), Patient Heath Questionnaire-9 (Kroenke et al., 2001), Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (Spitzer et al., 2006), Snaith–Hamilton Pleasure Scale (Nakonezny et al., 2010), Apathy Motivation Index (Ang et al., 2017), Adult Temperament Questionnaire Effortful Control subscale (Evans & Rothbart, 2007), Need for Cognition scale (Cacioppo et al., 1984) (further details in SI section 1.1.3, Table S1). We performed confirmatory factor analysis to combine clinician-rated and self-report measures of the following symptoms: anhedonia, anxiety, behavioral apathy, emotional apathy, social apathy, cognitive function symptoms, depressed mood/suicidality,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

and physical anergia/slowing, as well as for trait effortful control and need for cognition (see complete methods in SI section 1.2, statistics in Table S2, and specific items for each factor in Table S3).

Effort Foraging Task

For each participant, we estimated effort costs using the Effort Foraging Task (methods described in Experiment 2 of Bustamante et al., 2023). Briefly, in this task participants harvested apples in virtual orchards, which were converted to money as a bonus. Participants chose between harvesting a depleting patch, or traveling to a new patch that was costly in time and effort. Patches were presented blockwise. Blocks varied only in their effort requirement (cognitive: N-Back working memory task, 1-Back or 3-Back levels, and physical: rapid key pressing, 50% or 100% of individuals' maximum, Figure S.1, Nystrom et al., 2000; Treadway et al., 2009). Block duration was fixed at 7 minutes, with 2 blocks per travel task per effort type for 8 blocks total. Reaching a new patch was not dependent on task performance. Participants had to reach performance criterion during training to begin the foraging task. Analyses focused on 'exit thresholds', which index the reward expected to continue harvesting when the participant chose to exit the patch. Therefore, participants were excluded from the task if they had too few exit trials within an effort type or missed the response deadline on many foraging trials. The final sample included in behavioral analyses was 52 MDD participants (53 MDD participants in the physical effort condition) and 27 comparison participants (see SI section 1.3).



Figure 1: Effort Foraging Task Diagram. On each trial participants chose to harvest a virtual patch (apple tree) using the down arrow key, or travel to a new patch. Harvesting a patch yielded diminishing returns, whereas traveling to a new patch cost time and effort. Travel tasks were either the 1-Back or 3-Back levels of the N-Back task, or a smaller or larger number of rapid keypresses.

Marginal Value Theorem (MVT) model

Effort costs were estimated using a Hierarchical Bayesian logistic regression model based on the Marginal Value Theorem (MVT Charnov, 1976) to predict participants' choices to harvest or exit a patch by comparing expected reward on the next harvest against the average reward rate in the local block. MVT predicts a foraging agent should leave a patch when the instantaneous reward rate falls below the long run average reward rate. Therefore, decisions to leave the patch reveal perceived richness of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

the environment. The lower the exit threshold in the high relative to low effort condition ('change in exit threshold'), the larger the inferred effort cost. The model is described in full in Bustamante et al. 2023 and model details are in SI section 1.4. Model parameters are the cost of travel in low effort cognitive and physical effort conditions, and the marginal increase in cost of travel for high cognitive and physical effort conditions, and an inverse temperature (capturing decision stochasticity).

Symptom associations with effort costs

Within the MDD group, we ran a series of linear regression models to test for symptom severity effects on cognitive and physical effort costs. First, we predicted cognitive or physical effort costs from overall depression severity (i.e., Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression total) using linear regression. Next, we decomposed overall depression effects into specific symptoms. We predicted effort costs from each symptom domain separately in a series of regression models (z-scored, 7 tests for each effort cost). Because of mutual correlations between symptoms, we used multiple comparisons correction within a series of symptom models (FDR, 7 tests). Cognitive effort cost regressions controlled for cognitive task performance (3-Back D'), and age. Physical effort cost regressions controlled for physical task performance (% larger number of presses completed), age, and self-reported BMI (body mass index). Therefore, any symptom associations detected are over and above effects of travel task ability. Although the focus of our analyses is on symptoms in the MDD group only, we also report results zooming in to the currently depressed MDD group (excluding remitted participants) and zooming out to all participants (MDD and comparisons).

To confirm the specificity of observed relationships between cognitive and physical effort costs and symptoms, we estimated Meng, Rosenthal, and Rubin's z statistic (1992, comparison of correlations). We also used Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) as an omnibus analysis of multiple task measures relationships to multiple symptoms and demographic variables (see SI section 1.5).

Additional task measures

Participants may have differed in their ability to complete the required effort (i.e., N-Back task or rapid key-pressing), which could confound decision making differences and/or relate to symptoms. This is especially relevant for the cognitive effort task because, unlike the physical effort task, it was not calibrated to individual ability. We addressed this by controlling for performance in analyses relating effort costs to MDD symptoms (including the CCA). In addition, we directly examined performance i) differences between diagnostic groups, ii) association to overall depression and iii) association to certain symptom domains (see SI section 1.6).

Since the MVT suggests exit thresholds allow us to infer subjective reward rate, we predicted decreased overall exit thresholds associated with MDD (following Huys et al. (2015) and Niv et al. (2007)). We tested whether overall exit thresholds (estimated from the low effort conditions, which were least confounded by individual differences in effort sensitivity) were associated with i) diagnostic group, ii) overall depression, or iii) symptom domains (see SI section 1.6.2).

Results

Demographic and clinical characteristics

Diagnostic groups were matched on gender, race, age, parental education, household income, childhood income, and parents' years of education (see Table S4). The comparison group had more years of education than the MDD group, but years of education did not relate to effort cost variables and therefore we did not include it as covariate in analyses (see Table S4 and a correlation heatmap with task variables in Figure S.2). Depression severity varied widely in the MDD group (Figure S.3). The MDD

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

group scored higher on all symptom domains except for emotional apathy. Need for cognition did not differ between groups, while effortful control was higher in the comparison group (Figure S.4).

Effort costs relationships to clinical features

Diagnostic group differences

On average participants avoided effort (group-level posterior effort costs non-overlapping with zero, Table S5). There were no group differences in either effort cost in the MVT model or any other parameter, even when excluding remitted MDD participants (Figure 2, Table S6). There were also no group differences in the model-agnostic measure of effort sensitivity (SI section 1.8, Figure S.5).



Figure 2: Effort cost by diagnostic group and effort type. Left panel: individual differences histograms, x-axis indicates effort cost (larger values indicate more effort avoidance), y-axis indicates proportion of diagnostic group. Right panel: diagnostic group differences MVT model estimate (x-axis, circle indicates mean, thinner line indicates 95% CI, thicker line 80% CI), estimates> 0 indicates higher costs in MDD group, y-axis indicates effort type.

Overall depression severity

Surprisingly, overall depression severity was associated with *decreased* cognitive effort cost ($p<0.005$, Figure 3, Table 1). We did not find a reliable association with physical effort costs (Table 1); this difference in correlation magnitudes between the two types of effort was significant ($z=-2.27$, $p=0.023$). Results remained when restricting the analyses to only those participants with current MDD, or all participants (MDD and comparison, Table S7).

Next we sought to identify which symptom domains contributed to the cognitive effort cost relationship to overall depression, and whether physical effort cost was related to any symptom domain.

Symptom specific relationships

We fitted a series of regression models to estimate the relationships of symptom domains to cognitive and physical effort cost while controlling for high effort travel task performance. Anxiety was related to *decreased* cognitive effort cost (Figure 3, Table 1), and this pattern was maintained in the current MDD group and across all participants (comparisons included, Table S7). Decreased cognitive effort cost was also associated with anhedonia, behavioral apathy, cognitive function symptoms, depressed mood/suicidality, and physical anergia/slowing in the MDD group. This pattern was maintained when focusing in on the current MDD group (though only as a trend for anhedonia and cognitive function

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

symptoms) and when expanding out to all participants (though only a trend for cognitive function symptoms). Because symptoms are mutually correlated, it is unclear if these are a cluster of symptoms that all relate to decreased cognitive effort costs, or if a subset drove the relationship (see Figure S.2 for heatmap of symptoms and task correlations).

Based on our inclusion of participants with comorbid anxiety disorders and on prior literature relating anxiety to increased effortful model-based strategy, we hypothesized that anxiety symptoms could be driving the overall depression association with cognitive effort cost. Anxiety was also among the top symptoms with the strongest effects on cognitive effort cost. We tested whether any other symptoms were related to cognitive effort cost when controlling for anxiety and found no reliable relationships (although the behavioral apathy effect remained significant before, but not after, correcting for multiple comparisons, Table 1).

We next examined symptom associations with physical effort costs. Within the MDD group, anhedonia was associated with *increased* physical effort costs (Table 1). This effect remained when considering all participants but was only a trend in the current MDD group (Table S7). There was a significant difference in the magnitude of the correlation of cognitive and physical effort cost with anxiety (z=-2.49, p=0.013) and anhedonia (z=-3.23, p=0.001) within the MDD group.



Figure 3: Effort costs relationships to individual MDD symptom domains. Blue indicates cognitive effort and red indicates physical effort. A: y-axes: effort costs from MVT model, x-axes: symptom severity (z-scores) for overall depression (Hamilton Rating Scale Total), anhedonia, anxiety, behavioral apathy, cognitive function symptoms, depressed mood/suicidality, physical anergia/slowing, and social apathy (MDD group only).

Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA)

We used an omnibus analysis, CCA, as an additional means of addressing the non-independence of symptom domains, while also including all potentially relevant covariates. Within the MDD group we examined the relationship between task measures of interest (i.e., N-Back accuracy, cognitive and physical effort cost, and overall exit threshold) and symptom measures (simultaneously accounting for age, BMI, need for cognition, and self-reported effortful control). There were 5 dimensions, one of which was significant (Dimension 1 correlation=0.688, Wilks statistic=0.18, F-approx=1.66, df1=55, df2=207, p=0.006). Dimension 1 captured many of the same patterns as the symptom regression models, even when accounting for a larger number of other individual differences (summary table

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Symptom	Estimate	SE	*t*	*p*	$p_{adjusted}$
A. Cognitive effort cost, MDD					
Overall depression	-0.33	0.11	-2.97	0.005*	
Anhedonia	-2.87	1.28	-2.24	0.030	0.039*
Anxiety	-4.06	1.03	-3.93	0.0003	0.002*
Behavioral apathy	-4.15	1.37	-3.04	0.004	0.009*
Social apathy	-1.04	1.21	-0.86	0.391	0.391
Cognitive function symptoms	-2.29	1.04	-2.19	0.033	0.039*
Depressed mood/suicidality	-3.85	1.22	-3.14	0.003	0.009*
Physical anergia/slowing	-3.63	1.24	-2.93	0.005	0.009*
B. Physical effort cost, MDD					
Overall depression	0.10	0.28	0.36	0.718	
Anhedonia	9.11	3.06	2.97	0.005	0.035*
Anxiety	0.20	2.85	0.07	0.943	0.943
Behavioral apathy	7.83	3.42	2.29	0.027	0.094
Social apathy	1.13	2.83	0.40	0.692	0.807
Cognitive function symptoms	4.37	2.80	1.56	0.126	0.294
Depressed mood/suicidality	3.57	3.05	1.17	0.247	0.432
Physical anergia/slowing	2.48	3.36	0.74	0.463	0.648
C. Cognitive effort cost, MDD, controlling for anxiety					
Anhedonia	-1.83	1.19	-1.54	0.131	0.393
Behavioral apathy	-2.90	1.30	-2.23	0.031	0.183
Social apathy	-0.96	1.06	-0.91	0.367	0.440
Cognitive function symptoms	0.02	1.22	0.02	0.987	0.987
Depressed mood/suicidality	-1.64	1.48	-1.11	0.271	0.407
Physical anergia/slowing	-1.61	1.39	-1.17	0.250	0.407

Table 1: Symptom effort cost regressions (MDD group only). (A) Predicting cognitive effort cost from overall depression severity, and each symptom domain, controlling for cognitive task performance (3-Back D') and age. (B) Predicting physical effort cost from overall depression severity, and each symptom domain, controlling for physical task performance (% larger number of presses completed), BMI, and age. (C) Predicting cognitive effort cost from each symptom domain, controlling for anxiety, cognitive task performance (3-Back D') and age (* indicates $p<0.05$, FDR correction within symptom models).

in Table 2, full result in Figure S.6). For the Dimension 1 task behavior coefficients, cognitive effort cost was positive, physical effort cost was negative, and 3-Back D' was positive. For the Dimension 1 symptom coefficients, behavioral apathy, need for cognition, anhedonia, and anxiety were all negative. This pattern suggests a cluster of symptoms (i.e., behavioral apathy, anhedonia, anxiety) that are positively associated with physical effort cost, but negatively associated with cognitive effort cost, and that including need for cognition and 3-Back accuracy contributes to maximizing the correlation between task and symptom domains.

Additional task measures

Performance measures

All the effort cost symptom analyses reported so far are over and above any effects related to travel task ability (i.e., task performance), which was controlled for. We also examined diagnostic group dif-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Task behavior (coefficient)	**Symptom** (coefficient)
↑Cognitive Effort Cost (0.72)	↓Behavioral apathy (-0.44)
↓Physical Effort Cost (-0.68)	↓Need for cognition (-0.43)
↑3-Back D' (0.38)	↓Anhedonia (-0.41)
	↓Anxiety (-0.40)

Table 2: Canonical Correlation Analysis Result Summary. Canonical Dimension 1 was the only significant dimension (correlation=0.688, p<*0.006*, MDD group only). Canonical coefficients maximize the correlation between task behavior (column 1) and symptoms (column 2, accounting for age, BMI, need for cognition and effortful control). Dimension 1 coefficients displayed in descending order by absolute value (arrows correspond to positive or negative coefficients). Coefficients below absolute value 0.25 are not displayed. Consistent with the symptom regression model results, CCA shows that cognitive effort cost was negatively correlated with symptom severity (including anxiety, behavioral apathy, and anhedonia), while physical effort cost was positively correlated with symptom severity (including anhedonia).

ferences and performance associations to symptoms directly (results in SI section 1.10). There were minimal diagnostic group differences in performance, however, the MDD group completed a lower percentage of keypresses in the high physical effort condition and responded faster on average on the cognitive (N-Back) task (Figure S.7, Table S8). Neither cognitive nor physical performance was reliably related to overall depression. While anxiety symptoms were associated with cognitive effort costs, they were not associated with cognitive task performance. On the other hand, anhedonia symptoms were related to a lower percentage of completed keypresses in the low (but not high) physical effort condition (p<0.010). Cognitive task performance did not reliably predict cognitive effort cost, nor did physical performance predict physical effort cost, suggesting effort decisions and execution are dissociable in this task (Figure 4).

Subjective reward rate

Although we did not find any diagnostic group differences, overall exit thresholds were lower in participants with greater overall depression, and in participants with higher anxiety, depressed mood/suicidality, and physical anergia/slowing (Figure 5, Table 3). This is consistent with theories of reduced subjective reward rate representation associated with anergia and psychomotor slowing in depression (Huys et al., 2015).

Symptom	**Estimate**	**SE**	***t***	***p***	$p_{adjusted}$
Overall exit threshold, MDD					
Overall depression	-0.03	0.01	-2.20	0.032*	
Anhedonia	-0.24	0.13	-1.84	0.072	0.101
Anxiety	-0.27	0.11	-2.44	0.018	0.045*
Behavioral apathy	-0.32	0.14	-2.20	0.032	0.056
Social apathy	-0.08	0.12	-0.70	0.489	0.489
Cognitive function symptoms	-0.16	0.11	-1.49	0.142	0.166
Depressed mood/suicidality	-0.33	0.12	-2.75	0.008	0.045*
Physical anergia/slowing	-0.30	0.12	-2.42	0.019	0.045*

Table 3: Symptom overall exit threshold regressions (MDD group only). Predicting individual differences in overall exit thresholds (log, from low effort conditions) by symptom severity, controlling for age (* indicates p<0.05, FDR correction within symptom models).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 4: Travel task performance relationship to effort costs, overall depression, anhedonia, and anxiety. Only MDD group. Cognitive travel task performance (3-Back Accuracy (D'), y-axis) not reliably related to, A: cognitive effort cost, B: overall depression (Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression, z-score), nor C: anxiety symptoms (x-axis, z-score). Physical travel task performance (percent of larger number of presses completed, y-axis) not reliably related to, D: physical effort cost, E: overall depression, nor F: anxiety symptoms (x-axis).



Figure 5: Relationship of individual MDD symptom domains with overall exit threshold (MDD group only). B: Lower overall exit threshold (y-axes, log apples, estimated from low effort conditions) was significantly related to symptom severity (x-axes, z-scores) for overall depression (Hamilton Rating Scale Total), anxiety, depressed mood/suicidality, physical anergia/slowing.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Discussion

Summary of results

This cross-sectional study compared cognitive and physical effort-based decision-making using computational-model-derived parameters from the Effort Foraging Task (Bustamante et al., 2023), within-participant, in a heterogeneous group of participants with MDD, and comparison participants without MDD. We found novel and important dissociable relations between different symptom dimensions of MDD and cognitive versus physical effort. Our results corroborate several computational theories of depression and support the need to break down depression into its symptom domains, and to examine different components of effort- and value-based decision-making within-participants.

Diagnostic group differences

Based on previous findings we predicted MDD would be associated with increased effort avoidance for both cognitive (Ang et al., 2023; Hershenberg et al., 2016; Vinckier et al., 2022; Westbrook et al., 2022) and physical (Berwian et al., 2020; Cléry-Melin et al., 2011; Treadway et al., 2012; Vinckier et al., 2022; X.-H. Yang et al., 2014; Zou et al., 2020) effort. Contrary to our hypotheses, there were no group differences in either effort cost, though this is consistent with some null group results in other studies of cognitive (Barch et al., 2023; Tran et al., 2021) and physical effort avoidance (Cathomas et al., 2021; Sherdell et al., 2012; Tran et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022; X. Yang et al., 2021). There were also minimal differences in task *performance* apart from the MDD group having faster N-Back reaction times and completing fewer keypresses in the high physical effort condition. Cognitive and physical travel task performance and effort costs were not correlated in this sample, suggesting they are dissociable in this task.

Symptom associations with effort costs

More depressed participants in the MDD group were more willing to exert cognitive effort, and there was no such relationship with willingness to exert physical effort, suggesting some specificity with respect to effort type. We found the negative association between cognitive effort cost and overall depression was mostly accounted for by anxiety symptoms (no other symptom domain was related to cognitive effort cost controlling for anxiety). There was a significant difference in the magnitude of cognitive and physical effort costs correlation to anxiety (which had no reliable relationship to physical effort cost). To our knowledge no effort-based decision-making studies have reported decreased cognitive effort avoidance associated with MDD. This suggests that unaccounted variation in anxiety could contribute to inconsistent findings in previous studies.

The negative association between anxiety and cognitive effort cost is consistent with reports of increased model-based planning associated with anxiety in unselected samples (Gillan et al., 2016; Hunter et al., 2018). It is also consistent with proposals that increased cognitive effort exertion can act as a compensatory mechanism to maintain performance in the face of increased attentional demands posed by threat-related stimuli in anxiety (Eysenck et al., 2007). Clinically, increased willingness to exert cognitive effort may contribute to anxiety symptoms such as rumination and worry by an increased tendency towards planning and replay (see Bedder et al., 2023). To test this hypothesis future studies could relate anxiety symptoms of MDD to measures of cognitively effortful sampling strategies (e.g., Horizons Task, Infinite Bandits Task, R. Wilson et al., 2020; R. C. Wilson et al., 2014, though an unselected sample showed self-reported anxiety was associated with decreased effortful sampling, Smith et al., 2022). Higher cognitive effort tasks might have had the benefit of increasing cognitive load and reducing anxious thoughts (presumably via distraction) while completing the task. This is consistent with research showing reduced momentary anxiety during a high relative to low cognitive effort task (Vytal et al., 2012).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Although we aimed to minimize demand characteristics, the social context of the experimental may have motivated anxious participants to exert effort (rather than expressing underlying preferences). Findings from a large online study with the Effort Foraging Task showed anxiety was associated with increased cognitive effort cost (the opposite pattern as this study, Bustamante et al., 2023). However, the study was conducted in an unselected sample, and relied on self-reported symptoms, making it difficult to translate findings to the current clinical sample (another online study also did not report cognitive effort avoidance relationships to anxiety and depression, Patzelt et al., 2019).

Anhedonia was associated with increased physical effort costs both within the MDD group and across all participants, though only numerically in the current MDD group (consistent with some previous reports, Sherdell et al., 2012; Tran et al., 2021; X.-H. Yang et al., 2014, but not others, Berwian et al., 2017; Cathomas et al., 2021; Cléry-Melin et al., 2011; Vinckier et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2022; X. Yang et al., 2021; Zou et al., 2020). Willingness to exert cognitive effort showed the opposite relationship to anhedonia. Comparing correlations of cognitive and physical effort cost to anhedonia demonstrated differential relationships with cognitive and physical effort types.

Two lines of evidence support that observed relationships between behavior and MDD symptoms were driven by motivation rather than ability. First, all effort cost analyses accounted for ability (i.e., high effort performance) such that reported effects are over and above effects related to ability. Second, we did not find reliable direct relationships between ability and MDD symptoms.

Canonical correlation analysis

We used CCA as an omnibus analysis to examine the correlational structure between all the task measures of interest and symptoms accounting for traits (effortful control, need for cognition), and demographics factors (age and BMI) and found one significant canonical dimension. For the task coefficients, cognitive effort cost was positive, physical effort cost was negative, and 3-Back D' was positive. For the symptom coefficients behavioral apathy, need for cognition, anhedonia, and anxiety were all negative. This pattern suggests cognitive effort cost is negatively associated with symptom severity on this dimension, while physical effort cost is positively associated with symptom severity.

Subjective reward rate in depression

MVT predicts that decisions to leave a patch reveal perceived average reward rate, and this is supported by evidence in humans (e.g., lower thresholds under acute and chronic stress, and in persons with Parkinson's, Constantino et al., 2017; Lenow et al., 2017)). Following Huys et al. 2015, we hypothesized that MDD would be associated with reduced exit thresholds, reflecting lower average reward expectations. Overall exit thresholds did not differ by group but were decreased in MDD participants with greater overall depression severity, anxiety, depressed mood/suicidality, and physical anergia/slowing symptoms (this pattern was maintained in the current MDD group but not across all participants). This suggests a difference in value-based decision-making associated with the severity of MDD symptoms, such that environments may be subjectively represented as less rewarding, reducing goal-directed behavior and vigor (Huys et al., 2015; Niv et al., 2007).

Limitations

These results leave open the question of whether the observed symptom associations would generalize to other diagnostic groups (e.g., anxiety, bipolar, schizophrenia), or to other effort-based decision measures (e.g., tasks, ecological momentary assessment). To resolve whether the anxiety and cognitive effort cost association is specific to MDD or general across anxiety conditions future studies could include participants with primary clinical anxiety disorders. Another limitation of this study is the sample size. The smaller size of the comparison group may have contributed to the lack of observed diagnostic group differences (although aggregate behavior in this group was consistent with larger prior

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

samples, Bustamante et al., 2023). The small size of the remitted depressed group did not allow for comparing the remitted group to other groups. The cross-sectional design is also a limitation with respect to understanding causality between symptoms and task behavior. Longitudinal investigations would help to distinguish state versus trait influences on cognitive control and effort-based decision making and their ability to predict symptoms (e.g., rumination and worry).

Clinical implications

Ultimately insights from this research may be applied to interventions to increase willingness to exert effort for individuals experiencing challenges with goal-directed behavior. Therapies that use cognitive restructuring to target physical effort perception might be effective for addressing anhedonia symptoms. Therapies to address physical anergia/slowing may target subjective reward rate, possibly through pharmacological manipulations of dopamine (Niv et al., 2007). For therapeutic recommendations related to cognitive effort, the causal direction of the association with anxiety should be established. Does reduced cognitive effort cost cause anxiety symptoms, or did anxiety cause the observed pattern of behavior (i.e., benefits of distraction)? The tendency to be more willing to exert cognitive effort could be leveraged as a strength in treatment for individuals with anxious depression (e.g., positive fantasizing, more cognitively effortful therapies, novel therapeutic applications using distraction, Besten et al., 2023).

Code and Data availability

The analysis code and data will be openly available at the Open Science Framework upon publication.

Acknowledgements Thanks to Nicole Antkiewicz, Valerie Lilley, Yongjjing Ren, and Daniel Oliver for help with data collection. Thanks to Sam Zorowitz for technical assistance with remote task administration. This work was supported by the New Jersey Alliance for Clinical and Translational Science (UL1TR003017), the New Jersey Health Foundation (NJHF#PC158-23), and NIH Awards T32MH065214, T32DA007261, and R01MH124849.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

References

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

Ang, Y.-S., Lockwood, P., Apps, M. A. J., Muhammed, K., & Husain, M. (2017). Distinct subtypes of apathy revealed by the apathy motivation index. *PloS One*, *12*(1), e0169938. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169938

Barch, D. M., Culbreth, A. J., Ben Zeev, D., Campbell, A., Nepal, S., & Moran, E. K. (2023). Dissociation of cognitive effort-based decision making and its associations with symptoms, cognition, and everyday life function across schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and depression. *Biological Psychiatry*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2023.04.007

Bedder, R. L., Pisupati, S., & Niv, Y. (2023, May 17). Modelling rumination as a state-inference process. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/tfjqn

Berwian, I. M., Walter, H., Seifritz, E., & Huys, Q. J. M. (2017). Predicting relapse after antidepressant withdrawal – a systematic review [Publisher: Cambridge University Press]. *Psychological Medicine*, *47*(3), 426–437. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291716002580

Berwian, I. M., Wenzel, J. G., Collins, A. G. E., Seifritz, E., Stephan, K. E., Walter, H., & Huys, Q. J. M. (2020). Computational mechanisms of effort and reward decisions in patients with depression and their association with relapse after antidepressant discontinuation. *JAMA psychiatry*, *77*(5), 513–522. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.4971

Besten, M. E., van Tol, M.-J., van Rij, J., & van Vugt, M. K. (2023). The impact of mood-induction on maladaptive thinking in the vulnerability for depression. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, *81*, 101888. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2023.101888

Bliese, P., Chen, G., Downes, P., Schepker, D., & Lang, J. (2022, March 7). *Multilevel: Multilevel functions* (Version 2.7). Retrieved July 25, 2023, from https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/multilevel/index.html

Bustamante, L. A., Oshinowo, T., Lee, J. R., Tong, E., Burton, A. R., Shenhav, A., Cohen, J. D., & Daw, N. D. (2023). Effort foraging task reveals positive correlation between individual differences in the cost of cognitive and physical effort in humans [Publisher: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences]. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(50), e2221510120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2221510120

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Kao, C. F. (1984). The efficient assessment of need for cognition. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *48*(3), 306–307. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4803_13

Cathomas, F., Klaus, F., Guetter, K., Seifritz, E., Hartmann-Riemer, M. N., Tobler, P. N., Kaiser, S., & Kaliuzhna, M. (2021). Associations between negative symptoms and effort discounting in patients with schizophrenia and major depressive disorder. *Schizophrenia Bulletin Open*, *2*(1), sgab022. https://doi.org/10.1093/schizbullopen/sgab022

Charnov, E. L. (1976). Optimal foraging, the marginal value theorem. *Theoretical Population Biology*, *9*(2), 129–136. https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-5809(76)90040-X

Cléry-Melin, M.-L., Schmidt, L., Lafargue, G., Baup, N., Fossati, P., & Pessiglione, M. (2011). Why don't you try harder? an investigation of effort production in major depression. *PloS One*, *6*(8), e23178. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0023178

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Constantino, S. M., Dalrymple, J., Gilbert, R. W., Varanese, S., Di Rocco, A., & Daw, N. D. (2017, August 8). *A neural mechanism for the opportunity cost of time* (preprint). Neuroscience. https://doi.org/10.1101/173443

Constantino, S. M., & Daw, N. D. (2015). Learning the opportunity cost of time in a patch-foraging task. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, *15*(4), 837–853. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-015-0350-y

Cooper, J. A., Arulpragasam, A. R., & Treadway, M. T. (2018). Anhedonia in depression: Biological mechanisms and computational models. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *22*, 128–135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2018.01.024

Culbreth, A. J., Moran, E. K., Mahaphanit, W., Erickson, M. A., Boudewyn, M. A., Frank, M. J., Barch, D. M., MacDonald, A. W., III, Daniel Ragland, J., Luck, S. J., Silverstein, S. M., Carter, C. S., & Gold, J. M. (2023). A transdiagnostic study of effort-cost decision-making in psychotic and mood disorders. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, sbad155. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbad155

Evans, D. E., & Rothbart, M. K. (2007). Developing a model for adult temperament. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*(4), 868–888. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2006.11.002

Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory [Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association]. *Emotion*, *7*(2), 336–353. https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.336

Fava, M., Iosifescu, D. V., Pedrelli, P., & Baer, L. (2009). Reliability and validity of the massachusetts general hospital cognitive and physical functioning questionnaire. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, *78*(2), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.1159/000201934

First, M. B. (2015). Structured clinical interview for the DSM (SCID) [_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com In *The encyclopedia of clinical psychology* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118625392.wbecp351

Gagne, C., Zika, O., Dayan, P., & Bishop, S. J. (2020, December 22). *Impaired adaptation of learning to contingency volatility in internalizing psychopathology* [eLife] [Publisher: eLife Sciences Publications Limited]. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.61387

Gillan, C. M., Kosinski, M., Whelan, R., Phelps, E. A., & Daw, N. D. (2016). Characterizing a psychiatric symptom dimension related to deficits in goal-directed control. *eLife*, *5*, e11305. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.11305

González, I., & Déjean, S. (2021). *CCA: Canonical correlation analysis* (Version 1.2.1). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=CCA

Grahek, I., Everaert, J., Krebs, R. M., & Koster, E. H. W. (2018). Cognitive control in depression: Toward clinical models informed by cognitive neuroscience [Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc]. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *6*(4), 464–480. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702618758969

Grahek, I., Shenhav, A., Musslick, S., Krebs, R. M., & Koster, E. H. W. (2019). Motivation and cognitive control in depression. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *102*, 371–381. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.04.011

Halahakoon, D., & Roiser, J. (2016). Cognitive impairment in depression and its (non-)response to antidepressant treatment [Publisher: Evid Based Ment Health]. *Evidence-based mental health*, *19*(4). https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2016-102438

Hamilton, M. (1960). A rating scale for depression. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry*, *23*, 56–62. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.23.1.56

Hershenberg, R., Satterthwaite, T. D., Daldal, A., Katchmar, N., Moore, T. M., Kable, J. W., & Wolf, D. H. (2016). Diminished effort on a progressive ratio task in both unipolar

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

and bipolar depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *196*, 97–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.02.003

Hunter, L. E., Bornstein, A. M., & Hartley, C. A. (2018, December 20). *A common deliberative process underlies model-based planning and patient intertemporal choice* [Section: New Results Type: article]. bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/499707

Husain, M., & Roiser, J. P. (2018). Neuroscience of apathy and anhedonia: A transdiagnostic approach [Number: 8 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group]. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *19*(8), 470–484. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-018-0029-9

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

Jaeger, J., Berns, S., Uzelac, S., & Davis-Conway, S. (2006). Neurocognitive deficits and disability in major depressive disorder. *Psychiatry Research*, *145*(1), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2005.11.011

Kessler, R. C., Nelson, C. B., McGonagle, K. A., Liu, J., Swartz, M., & Blazer, D. G. (1996). Comorbidity of DSM-III-r major depressive disorder in the general population: Results from the US national comorbidity survey. *The British Journal of Psychiatry. Supplement*, (30), 17–30.

Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *16*(9), 606–613. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x

Lenow, J. K., Constantino, S. M., Daw, N. D., & Phelps, E. A. (2017). Chronic and acute stress promote overexploitation in serial decision making. *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, *37*(23), 5681–5689. https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3618-16.2017

Lewandowski, D., Kurowicka, D., & Joe, H. (2009). Generating random correlation matrices based on vines and extended onion method. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, *100*(9), 1989–2001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2009.04.008

Lynch, C. J., Gunning, F. M., & Liston, C. (2020). Causes and consequences of diagnostic heterogeneity in depression: Paths to discovering novel biological depression subtypes. *Biological Psychiatry*, *88*(1), 83–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2020.01.012

Meng, X.-l., Rosenthal, R., & Rubin, D. B. (1992). Comparing correlated correlation coefficients [Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association]. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*, 172–175. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.172

Menzel, U. (2022). *CCP: Significance tests for canonical correlation analysis (CCA)* (Version 1.2). https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=CCP

Millan, M. J., Agid, Y., Brüne, M., Bullmore, E. T., Carter, C. S., Clayton, N. S., Connor, R., Davis, S., Deakin, B., DeRubeis, R. J., Dubois, B., Geyer, M. A., Goodwin, G. M., Gorwood, P., Jay, T. M., Joëls, M., Mansuy, I. M., Meyer-Lindenberg, A., Murphy, D., … Young, L. J. (2012). Cognitive dysfunction in psychiatric disorders: Characteristics, causes and the quest for improved therapy. *Nature Reviews. Drug Discovery*, *11*(2), 141–168. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3628

Nakonezny, P. A., Carmody, T. J., Morris, D. W., Kurian, B. T., & Trivedi, M. H. (2010). Psychometric evaluation of the snaith-hamilton pleasure scale in adult outpatients with major depressive disorder. *International Clinical Psychopharmacology*, *25*(6), 328–333. https://doi.org/10.1097/YIC.0b013e32833eb5ee

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Niv, Y., Daw, N. D., Joel, D., & Dayan, P. (2007). Tonic dopamine: Opportunity costs and the control of response vigor. *Psychopharmacology*, *191*(3), 507–520. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-006-0502-4

Nystrom, L. E., Braver, T. S., Sabb, F. W., Delgado, M. R., Noll, D. C., & Cohen, J. D. (2000). Working memory for letters, shapes, and locations: fMRI evidence against stimulus-based regional organization in human prefrontal cortex. *NeuroImage*, *11*(5), 424–446. https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2000.0572

O'Reilly, R. C., Hazy, T. E., Mollick, J., Mackie, P., & Herd, S. (2014, April 30). Goal-driven cognition in the brain: A computational framework. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1404.7591

Orne, M. T. (1962). On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: With particular reference to demand characteristics and their implications [Place: US Publisher: American Psychological Association]. *American Psychologist*, *17*(11), 776–783. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043424

Overall, J. E., & Gorham, D. R. (1962). The brief psychiatric rating scale [Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc]. *Psychological Reports*, *10*(3), 799–812. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1962.10.3.799

Patzelt, E. H., Kool, W., Millner, A. J., & Gershman, S. J. (2019). The transdiagnostic structure of mental effort avoidance [Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group]. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 1689. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-37802-1

Pessiglione, M., Vinckier, F., Bouret, S., Daunizeau, J., & Le Bouc, R. (2018). Why not try harder? computational approach to motivation deficits in neuro-psychiatric diseases. *Brain*, *141*(3), 629–650. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awx278

RCoreTeam. (2015). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Retrieved February 13, 2022, from https://www.r-project.org/

Rigoux, L., & Guigon, E. (2012). A model of reward- and effort-based optimal decision making and motor control. *PLoS computational biology*, *8*(10), e1002716. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002716

Rizopoulos, D. (2006). **ltm** : An *R* package for latent variable modeling and item response theory analyses. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *17*(5). https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v017.i05

Rock, P. L., Roiser, J. P., Riedel, W. J., & Blackwell, A. D. (2014). Cognitive impairment in depression: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Medicine*, *44*(10), 2029–2040. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291713002535

Rosenblat, J. D., Kakar, R., & McIntyre, R. S. (2016). The cognitive effects of antidepressants in major depressive disorder: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, *19*(2), pyv082. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyv082

Salamone, J. D., Correa, M., Yang, J.-H., Rotolo, R., & Presby, R. (2018). Dopamine, effort-based choice, and behavioral economics: Basic and translational research. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *12*. Retrieved May 30, 2023, from https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnbeh.2018.00052

Shenhav, A., Botvinick, M. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2013). The expected value of control: An integrative theory of anterior cingulate cortex function. *Neuron*, *79*(2), 217–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2013.07.007

Shenhav, A., Musslick, S., Lieder, F., Kool, W., Griffiths, T. L., Cohen, J. D., & Botvinick, M. M. (2017). Toward a rational and mechanistic account of mental effort [_eprint:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-072116-031526]. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *40*(1), 99–124. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-neuro-072116-031526

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

Smith, R., Taylor, S., Wilson, R. C., Chuning, A. E., Persich, M. R., Wang, S., & Killgore, W. D. S. (2022). Lower levels of directed exploration and reflective thinking are associated with greater anxiety and depression. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *12*. Retrieved February 10, 2024, from https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychiatry/articles/10.3389/fpsyt.2021.782136

Snyder, H. R. (2013). Major depressive disorder is associated with broad impairments on neuropsychological measures of executive function: A meta-analysis and review. *Psychological bulletin*, *139*(1), 81–132. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028727

Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B. W., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: The GAD-7. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *166*(10), 1092–1097. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092

Tran, T., Hagen, A. E. F., Hollenstein, T., & Bowie, C. R. (2021). Physical- and cognitive-effort-based decision-making in depression: Relationships to symptoms and functioning [Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc]. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *9*(1), 53–67. https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702620949236

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

Treadway, M. T., Buckholtz, J. W., Schwartzman, A. N., Lambert, W. E., & Zald, D. H. (2009). Worth the 'EEfRT'? the effort expenditure for rewards task as an objective measure of motivation and anhedonia [Publisher: Public Library of Science]. *PLOS ONE*, *4*(8), e6598. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0006598

Vinckier, F., Jaffre, C., Gauthier, C., Smajda, S., Abdel-Ahad, P., Le Bouc, R., Daunizeau, J., Fefeu, M., Borderies, N., Plaze, M., Gaillard, R., & Pessiglione, M. (2022). Elevated effort cost identified by computational modeling as a distinctive feature explaining multiple behaviors in patients with depression. *Biological Psychiatry. Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*, *7*(11), 1158–1169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2022.07.011

Vytal, K., Cornwell, B., Arkin, N., & Grillon, C. (2012). Describing the interplay between anxiety and cognition: From impaired performance under low cognitive load to reduced anxiety under high load [_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2012.01358.x]. *Psychophysiology*, *49*(6), 842–852. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2012.01358.x

Walton, M. E., Rudebeck, P. H., Bannerman, D. M., & Rushworth, M. F. S. (2007). Calculating the cost of acting in frontal cortex. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1104*, 340–356. https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1390.009

Wang, Y.-y., Wang, Y., Huang, J., Sun, X.-h., Wang, X.-z., Zhang, S.-x., Zhu, G.-h., Lui, S. S. Y., Cheung, E. F. C., Sun, H.-w., & Chan, R. C. K. (2022). Shared and distinct reward neural mechanisms among patients with schizophrenia, major depressive disorder, and bipolar disorder: An effort-based functional imaging study. *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, *272*(5), 859–871. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-021-01376-3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Westbrook, A., Yang, X., Bylsma, L. M., Daches, S., George, C. J., Seidman, A. J., Jennings, J. R., & Kovacs, M. (2022). Economic choice and heart rate fractal scaling indicate that cognitive effort is reduced by depression and boosted by sad mood. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2022.07.008

Wilson, R., Wang, S., Sadeghiyeh, H., & Cohen, J. D. (2020). Deep exploration as a unifying account of explore-exploit behavior [Publisher: PsyArXiv].

Wilson, R. C., Geana, A., White, J. M., Ludvig, E. A., & Cohen, J. D. (2014). Humans use directed and random exploration to solve the explore-exploit dilemma. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, *143*(6), 2074–2081. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038199

Yang, X., Huang, J., Harrision, P., Roser, M. E., Tian, K., Wang, D., & Liu, G. (2021). Motivational differences in unipolar and bipolar depression, manic bipolar, acute and stable phase schizophrenia. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *283*, 254–261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2021.01.075

Yang, X.-H., Huang, J., Zhu, C.-Y., Wang, Y.-F., Cheung, E. F. C., Chan, R. C. K., & Xie, G.-R. (2014). Motivational deficits in effort-based decision making in individuals with subsyndromal depression, first-episode and remitted depression patients. *Psychiatry Research*, *220*(3), 874–882. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2014.08.056

Zou, Y.-M., Ni, K., Wang, Y.-Y., Yu, E.-Q., Lui, S. S. Y., Zhou, F.-C., Yang, H.-X., Cohen, A. S., Strauss, G. P., Cheung, E. F. C., & Chan, R. C. K. (2020). Effort-cost computation in a transdiagnostic psychiatric sample: Differences among patients with schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depressive disorder. *PsyCh Journal*, *9*(2), 210–222. https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.316

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

1 Supplementary Material

Contents

- SI section 1.1 Study overview
- SI section 1.1.2 Demographics by diagnostic group methods
- SI section 1.1.3 Clinician ratings and self-reports
- SI section 1.2 Symptoms confirmatory factor analysis methods
- Table S1 Clinical interview and self-report battery
- Table S2 Confirmatory symptom factors alpha and diagnostic group differences
- Table S3 Items for confirmatory symptom factors
- Figure S.1 Travel task methods
- SI section 1.3 Foraging behavior analysis exclusions
- SI section 1.4 MVT Model methods
- SI section 1.5 CCA Methods
- SI section 1.6 Additional task measures methods
- SI section 1.6.2 Overall exit threshold
- Table S4 Demographic factors by diagnostic group
- Figure S.2 Task behavior symptom heatmap
- Figure S.3 MDD sample characteristics
- Figure S.4 Symptom severity by diagnostic group
- Table S5 MVT Group-level parameter posterior distributions
- Table S6 Diagnostic group difference MVT model
- SI section 1.8 Model-agnostic sensitivity to effort manipulation
- Figure S.5 Model-agnostic change in exit threshold by diagnostic group
- Table S7 Symptoms effort cost regressions, current MDD and all participants
- Figure S.6 Canonical Correlation Analysis
- SI section 1.10 Additional task measures results
- Figure S.7 Travel task performance by diagnostic group
- Table S8 Diagnostic group differences in travel task performance

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

1.1 Study overview

The study was conducted at the Rutgers-Princeton Center for Computational Neuro-Psychiatry by trained clinical researchers. The study was approved by the Rutgers University Institutional Review Board. Participants were recruited in outpatient clinics at Rutgers University, as well as via Google Ads. We recruited participants with MDD confirmed using the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 (First, 2015, SCID-5) and no co-occurring psychiatric conditions except for anxiety disorders, which were permitted. MDD participants in remission ("no significant symptoms during the past 2 months") and in partial remission ("symptoms are present but full criteria are not met, for a period less than 2 months") were permitted. We also recruited a demographically matched comparison group without any psychiatric diagnosis. The study was administered remotely via secure web-based software (Zoom, except for 5 MDD participants who came an in-person session) and participants were compensated $20 per hour and an Effort Foraging Task bonus of up to $10. On the first session a clinical interviewer administered the SCID-5 and participants completed self-report surveys. On the second session participants completed the Effort Foraging Task. In a third session participants completed tasks assessing reward sensitivity and cognitive control recruitment in response to efficacy manipulations, which will be reported separately.

1.1.1 Study inclusion and exclusion criteria

The study inclusion criteria were 1) between the ages of 18-65, 2) has the capacity to provide informed consent, and 3) is fluent in English, 4) score of 6 of higher on the Wechsler Test of Adult Reading, 5) (MDD only) Meets DSM-5 criteria for MDD as confirmed by the SCID-5, (MDD only) if the participant is treated with anti-depressant medication, they are on stable treatment with this medication (i.e. no change in medication type, or substantial change in dose, for at least 4 weeks prior to participating in the study). The study exclusion criteria were 1) history of traumatic brain injury or head injury, 2) Intellectual disability or pervasive developmental disorder, 3) neurological disease, 4) has met DSM-5 criteria for a substance-use disorder within the last 6 months per the SCID-5 (with the exception of nicotine dependence, which was permitted), 5) received electroconvulsive therapy within the last 8 weeks, 6) left-handedness (due to keyboard set up for the Effort Foraging Task), 7) (comparisons only) meets DSM-5 criteria for any psychiatric diagnosis as confirmed by the SCID-5, 8) (comparisons only) current use of any psychotropic medication.

1.1.2 Demographics by diagnostic group methods

We used Pearson's Chi-squared test to compare categorical diagnostic group differences (gender, race, ethnicity, total household income, occupational status, relationship status, alcohol frequency, alcohol amount, caffeine amount, tobacco use), and Welch two sample unpaired t-test to compare continuous diagnostic group differences (age, childhood income, years of education for self and parents), using the chisq.test and t.test functions of the stats package in the R language, RCoreTeam, 2015). If diagnostic groups were not matched on a demographic variable, we checked whether it was correlated with effort costs in the MDD group and in all participants (Pearson's product-moment correlation, cor.test function, stats package in R).

1.1.3 Clinician ratings and self-reports

The Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 (First, 2015, SCID-5), Overview, Mood, Psychotic, and Substance-Use Disorder modules were used to confirm assignment of MDD and comparison groups, and that participants met study diagnostic criteria. Based on responses in the SCID-5, the clinical interviewer completed the Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression measure of the severity of different symptoms in the past week (Hamilton, 1960). This was followed by the semi-structured interview the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (Overall & Gorham, 1962) to assess current psychiatric-symptom

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

severity. Next participants completed self-report surveys to measure; cognitive function symptoms and physical anergia with the Massachusetts General Hospital Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire (Fava et al., 2009), depression symptoms with the Patient Heath Questionnaire-9 (Kroenke et al., 2001), anxiety symptoms with the Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (Spitzer et al., 2006), anhedonia symptoms with the Snaith–Hamilton Pleasure Scale (Nakonezny et al., 2010), behavioral, emotional, and social apathy with the Apathy Motivation Index (Ang et al., 2017). We also measured trait executive function with the Adult Temperament Questionnaire Effortful Control subscale (Evans & Rothbart, 2007), and trait cognitive control seeking with the Need for Cognition scale (Cacioppo et al., 1984).

Scale name	N items	Abbreviation	Time scale
Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression	21	HAM-D	Past week
Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale	24	BPRS	Last 2 weeks
MGH Cognitive and Physical Functioning Questionnaire	7	MGH-CPFQ	last month
Patient Health Questionnaire-9	9	PHQ-9	last 2 weeks
Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7	7	GAD7	last 2 weeks
Apathy Motivation Index	14	AMI	last 2 weeks
Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale	13	SHAPS	last few days
Adult Temperament Questionnaire-Effortful Control	19	ATQ-EC	trait
Need for Cognition	18	NFC	trait
Total Self-report	87		

Table S1: Clinical interview and self-report battery. Clinical interview and self-reports were completed in session 1 in the order listed in this table. Scales asking about similar timescales were grouped together.

1.2 Symptoms confirmatory factor analysis methods

We performed confirmatory factor analysis and assigned items from clinician ratings and self-report into the following domains (using measures listed in Table S1, exact items in Table S3): anhedonia, anxiety, behavioral apathy, cognitive function symptoms, depressed mood, effortful control (trait), emotional apathy, need for cognition (trait), physical anergia/slowing, social apathy. Assigned items were Z-scored and averaged to compute a symptom score in (1) the MDD group only, and (2) all participants. Using measures from the MDD group only for each domain we measured the internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha (ltm package cronbach.alpha function, see Table S2, Rizopoulos, 2006). We inspected the inter-item correlations using (multilevel package, item.total function, Bliese et al., 2022), items with inter-item correlation below 0.2 were eliminated. The resulting items were used for both (1) MDD only and (2) all participant composite symptom scores. We tested whether diagnostic groups significantly differed in symptom intensity and cognitive control trait measures using t-tests (Table S2). For left skewed distributions (comparisons clustered on very low symptom scores for anxiety, cognitive function symptoms, depressed mood, and physical anergia/slowing) we confirmed the diagnostic group differences results were maintained using the non-parametric Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction (wilcox.test function of the stats package in the R language, RCoreTeam, 2015).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Symptom domain	alpha(95% CI)	N	MDD	Comp.	t	df	p
Anhedonia	0.89(0.84-0.92)	15	0.132	-0.294	3.07	55.46	0.003
Anxiety	0.90(0.86-0.93)	10	0.197	-0.626	7.386	83.523	<0.001
Appetite symptoms	0.52(0.20-0.69)	3	0.091	-0.609	5.501	76.74	<0.001
Behavioral apathy	0.72(0.53-0.82)	8	0.186	-0.554	6.124	58.79	<0.001
Emotional apathy	0.54(0.30-0.68)	5	-0.049	0.137	-1.22	44.08	0.230
Social apathy	0.71(0.55-0.81)	5	0.149	-0.331	3.303	58.024	0.002
Cognitive function symp.	0.84(0.75-0.89)	5	0.257	-0.572	6.880	80.293	<0.001
Depressed mood	0.86(0.81-0.90)	8	0.106	-0.626	7.508	66.346	<0.001
Effortful control (trait)	0.84(0.76-0.88)	17	-0.177	0.393	-6.29	80.5	<0.001
Need for cognition (trait)	0.90(0.85-0.93)	17	-0.033	0.074	-0.794	58.151	0.430
Physical anergia/slowing	0.76(0.64-0.84)	7	0.157	-0.611	7.616	84.89	<0.001

Table S2: Confirmatory symptom factors alpha and diagnostic group differences. Column 1: symptom domain, column 2: Cronbach's alpha (95% confidence interval), column 3: number of items, column 4-8: MDD mean, Comparison mean, and t-statistic, degrees of freedom, p-value. Emotional apathy and appetite symptoms has low Cronbach's alpha scores and were not included in further analysis.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Category	Items	Scale
Anhedonia	Little interest or pleasure in doing things	PHQ-9
Anhedonia	I would enjoy my favorite television or radio program	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would enjoy being with family or close friends	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would find pleasure in my hobbies and pastimes	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would be able to enjoy my favorite meal	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would enjoy a warm bath or refreshing shower	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would find pleasure in the scent of flowers or the smell of a fresh sea breeze or freshly baked bread	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would enjoy seeing other people's smiling faces	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would enjoy looking smart when I have made an effort with my appearance	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would enjoy reading a book, magazine or newspaper	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would enjoy a cup of tea or coffee or my favorite drink	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would find pleasure in small things; e.g., bright sunny day, a telephone call from a friend	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would be able to enjoy a beautiful landscape or view	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would get pleasure from helping others	SHAPS
Anhedonia	I would feel pleasure when I receive praise from other people	SHAPS
Anxiety	Anxiety psychic	HAM-D
Anxiety	Anxiety - somatic	HAM-D
Anxiety	Anxiety	BPRS
Anxiety	Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge	GAD-7
Anxiety	Not being able to stop or control worrying	GAD-7
Anxiety	Worrying too much about different things	GAD-7
Anxiety	Trouble relaxing	GAD-7
Anxiety	Being so restless that it's hard to sit still	GAD-7
Anxiety	Becoming easily annoyed or irritable	GAD-7
Anxiety	Feeling afraid as if something awful might happen	GAD-7
Behavioral apathy	How has your motivation/interest/enthusiasm been over the past month?	MGH-CPFQ
Behavioral apathy	Work and interests	HAM-D
Behavioral apathy	Self-neglect	BPRS
Behavioral apathy	I make decisions firmly and without hesitation.	AMI
Behavioral apathy	When I decide to do something, I am able to make an effort easily.	AMI
Behavioral apathy	I get things done when they need to be done, without requiring reminders from others.	AMI
Behavioral apathy	When I decide to do something, I am motivated to see it through to the end.	AMI
Behavioral apathy	When I have something I need to do, I do it straightaway so it is out of the way.	AMI
Emotional apathy	Emotional withdrawal	BPRS
Emotional apathy	I feel sad or upset when I hear bad news.	AMI
Emotional apathy	Based on the last two weeks, I would say I care deeply about how my loved ones think of me.	AMI
Emotional apathy	I feel bad when I hear an acquaintance has an accident or illness.	AMI
Emotional apathy	If I realize I have been unpleasant to someone, I will feel terribly guilty afterwards.	AMI

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Category	Items	Scale
Social apathy	I start conversations with random people.	AMI
Social apathy	I enjoy doing things with people I have just met.	AMI
Social apathy	I suggest activities for me and my friends to do.	AMI
Social apathy	I go out with friends on a weekly basis.	AMI
Social apathy	I start conversations without being prompted.	AMI
Appetite	Somatic symptoms - gastro-intestinal	HAM-D
Appetite	Weight loss	HAM-D
Appetite	Poor appetite or overeating	PHQ-9
Effortful control (trait)	I am often late for appointments.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	I often make plans that I do not follow through with.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	I can keep performing a task even when I would rather not do it.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	I can make myself work on a difficult task even when I don't feel like trying.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	If I think of something that needs to be done, I usually get right to work on it.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	I usually finish doing things before they are actually due (for example, paying bills, finishing homework, etc.).	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	When I am afraid of how a situation might turn out, I usually avoid dealing with it.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	It's often hard for me to alternate between two different tasks.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	When I am trying to focus my attention, I am easily distracted.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	When interrupted or distracted, I usually can easily shift my attention back to whatever I was doing before.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	It is very hard for me to focus my attention when I am distressed.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	When I am happy and excited about an upcoming event, I have a hard time focusing my attention on tasks that require concentration.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	Even when I feel energized, I can usually sit still without much trouble if it's necessary.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	I can easily resist talking out of turn, even when I'm excited and want to express an idea.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	I usually have trouble resisting my cravings for food drink, etc.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	When I'm excited about something, it's usually hard for me to resist jumping right into it before I've considered the possible consequences.	ATQ-EC
Effortful control (trait)	When I see an attractive item in a store, it's usually very hard for me to resist buying it.	ATQ-EC
Need for cognition (trait)	I would prefer complex to simple problems.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	Thinking is not my idea of fun.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities.	NFC

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Category	Items	Scale
Need for cognition (trait)	I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is a likely chance I will have to think in depth about something	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I find satisfaction in deliberating hard and for long hours.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I only think as hard as I have to.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I prefer to think about small daily projects to long term ones.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I like tasks that require little thought once I've learned them.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	The idea of relying on thought to make my way to the top appeals to me.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	Learning new ways to think doesn't excite me very much.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I prefer my life to be filled with puzzles I must solve.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I would prefer a task that is intellectual, difficult, and important to one that is somewhat important but does not require much thought.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	I feel relief rather than satisfaction after completing a task that requires a lot of mental effort.	NFC
Need for cognition (trait)	It's enough for me that something gets the job done; I don't care how or why it works.	NFC
Cognitive function symptoms	Distractibility (speech and actions interrupted by stimuli unrelated to the interview)	BPRS
Cognitive function symptoms	How has your ability to focus/sustain attention been over the past month?	MGH-CPFQ
Cognitive function symptoms	How has your ability to remember/recall information been over the past month?	MGH-CPFQ
Cognitive function symptoms	How has your ability to find words been over the past month?	MGH-CPFQ
Cognitive function symptoms	How has your sharpness/mental acuity been over the past month?	MGH-CPFQ
Cognitive function symptoms	Trouble concentrating on things, such as reading the newspaper or watching television	PHQ-9
Depressed mood	Depressed mood	HAM-D
Depressed mood	Feelings of guilt	HAM-D
Depressed mood	Suicide	HAM-D
Depressed mood	Depression	BPRS
Depressed mood	Suicidality	BPRS
Depressed mood	Guilt	BPRS
Depressed mood	Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless	PHQ-9
Depressed mood	Feeling bad about yourself - or that you are a failure or have let yourself or your family down	PHQ-9
Depressed mood	Thoughts that you would be better off dead, or of hurting yourself	PHQ-9
Physical anergia/slowing	Somatic symptoms - general	HAM-D
Physical anergia/slowing	Psychomotor retardation	HAM-D

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Category	Items	Scale
Physical anergia/slowing	Motor retardation (slowed or reduced movements or speech)	BPRS
Physical anergia/slowing	How has your wakefulness/alertness been over the past month?	MGH-CPFQ
Physical anergia/slowing	How has your energy been over the past month?	MGH-CPFQ
Physical anergia/slowing	Feeling tired or having little energy	PHQ-9
Physical anergia/slowing	Moving or speaking so slowly that other people could have noticed. Or the opposite - being so figety or restless that you have been moving around a lot more than usual.	PHQ-9

Table S3: Items for confirmatory symptom factors. Column 1: symptom domain, column 2: items, column 3: measurement scale (abbreviations in Table S1).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure S.1: Travel task methods. Left panel: cognitive effort, N-Back working memory task. Participants responded whether the letter on the screen was the same ('s' key) or different ('d' key). The background color differed for the high effort (3-Back, orange) and low effort (1-Back, blue) conditions. Key icons next to each screen indicate the correct response. Right panel: physical effort, rapid key-pressing task. Participants rapidly pressed the 'a' key while holding down the 'w', 'e', 'f' (left hand), 'h' and 'o' keys (right hand). Pressing the 'a' key moved the avatar rightwards and filled up the grey horizontal bar with green. When participants reached the goal number of presses 'Complete!' appeared in the horizontal bar and participants waited for the remainder of the travel time. The background color differed for the high effort (smaller presses, 50% of maximum, purple) and low effort (larger presses, 100% of maximum, green) conditions.

1.3 Foraging behavior analysis exclusions

Of the 60 MDD and 27 comparison participants, 1 MDD participant did not complete the effort foraging task due to technical difficulties with their keyboard. All other participants completed the Effort Foraging Task, however technical difficulties with the experiment server caused 4 missing data files from the MDD group. Participants were also excluded from the task if they missed the response deadline on many foraging trials (excluded greater than 2 standard deviations above the mean number, mean=3.1% missed, SD=6% missed trials, cutoff=15.1%, 1 MDD participant excluded who missed 49.5% of trials). Participants were also excluded if they had too few exit trials within an effort type, making their data under-powered for logistic regression analyses (less than 2.5 SD below the mean number of exit trials per condition, mean=19.7 exit trials, SD=5.4, cutoff=6.1 exit trials). As a result 1 MDD participant was excluded for the whole task (1 exit in larger presses condition, 3 exits in interference condition) and 1 MDD participant was excluded from the cognitive effort analyses (2 exits for the 3-Back condition). Therefore, final sample size included in analyses was 52 MDD participants (53 MDD participants in the physical effort condition) and 27 comparison participants.

1.4 MVT Model methods

Model priors were determined based on posterior distributions from Bustamante et al. 2023 (prior group-level mean: inverse temperature $\mathcal{N}(0, 2)$, cognitive low effort cost $\mathcal{N}(80, 75)$, cognitive high effort cost $\mathcal{N}(0, 15)$, physical low effort cost $\mathcal{N}(80, 75)$, physical high effort cost $\mathcal{N}(0, 15)$, prior group-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

level scale: inverse temperature $\mathcal{N}(2, 2)$, cognitive low effort cost $\mathcal{N}(75, 75)$, cognitive high effort cost $\mathcal{N}(15, 15)$, physical low effort cost $\mathcal{N}(75, 75)$, physical high effort cost $\mathcal{N}(15, 15)$). There was a full covariance matrix between parameters, with a prior that was unbiased as to the presence or absence of inter-parameter correlations (LKJ Correlation Distribution prior=1, Lewandowski et al., 2009).

To test for diagnostic group (g) differences, we fitted a Hierarchical Bayesian MVT model in which each of the 5 group-level parameters (p) had a diagnostic group effect ($\beta_{g,p}$) added to it. For a participant (i) in diagnostic group (g_i) each participant-level parameter p_i was the sum of the group-level parameter p and the diagnostic group effect ($p_i = p + \beta_{g,p} * g_i$, where $g_{MDD}, g_{Comparison} \in 0.5, -0.5$). The diagnostic group effect parameter ($\beta_{g,p}$) had a prior distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 5)$, values greater than zero indicate higher effort costs in the MDD relative to comparison group. To confirm the remitted and partial remitted participants did not change the results, we also used this model to test for group differences of the comparison group to the currently depressed subset of the MDD group.

1.5 CCA Methods

We conducted Canonical Correlation Analysis using the CCA package in the R programming language (González & Déjean, 2021). The CCA Figure S.6 included 60 participants, 5 task variables (1-Back and 3-Back accuracy, cognitive and physical effort cost, overall exit threshold), and 11 survey variables (anhedonia, anxiety, behavioral apathy, cognitive function symptoms, depressed mood/suicidality, social apathy, physical anergia/slowing, Need for Cognition, Effortful Control, BMI, and age). We used the Wilks' Lambda asymptotic test for statistical significant of canonical correlation coefficients (using the p.asym function from the CCP package in R, Menzel, 2022).

1.6 Additional task measures methods

1.6.1 Task ability

Using a series of regression models, we tested whether diagnostic groups differed on effortful travel task performance. For the cognitive (N-Back) task we tested for differences in accuracy, reaction time, and missed trials. Using linear regression, we predicted N-Back accuracy (D') by N-Back level interacted with diagnostic group. We predicted N-Back (log transformed) reaction times across all trials by a 4-way interaction between N-Back level, correct or incorrect response, target or non-target trial, and diagnostic group, controlling for age. We used logistic mixed effects regression to predict the percent of missed N-Back trials by diagnostic group.

For the physical effort (rapid key-pressing) task we compared the groups on the required number of keypresses (determined during calibration) and the percent of keypresses completed during travel. Using linear regression we predicted required keypresses by diagnostic group controlling for age. In a linear mixed effects regression, we predicted the percent of completed keypresses per travel interval by the effort level (smaller or larger number of presses) interacted with diagnostic group, controlling for age and BMI.

We tested whether cognitive and physical effort costs were dissociable from task ability (i.e., performance). Using data from all participants, in the first model we predicted cognitive effort cost by 1-Back and 3-Back D', controlling for age. In the second model we predicted cognitive effort cost by the change in D' from 1-Back to 3-Back (which in line with effort cost as a change score from low to high effort). In the third model we predicted physical effort cost by the percent of key presses completed in the larger number of presses, and the smaller number of presses condition, controlling for age and BMI.

1.6.2 Overall exit threshold

Overall exit threshold individual differences were estimated from a linear mixed effects regression model that predicted exit thresholds (log apples) in low effort orchards (which were least confounded

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

by effects of effort) with effort type as a fixed effect, and random intercepts per participant. To test for diagnostic group differences, we added diagnostic group to the regression. To test for relationships with depression symptoms in the MDD group only, we ran a series of linear regressions predicting overall exit threshold by i) overall depression, and ii) each of the symptom domains separately (7 tests), controlling for age. We corrected for multiple comparisons across symptoms (FDR, 7 tests). We repeated these analyses zooming in to the currently depressed MDD group only and zooming out to all participants.

	MDD		***Comparison***		***Group difference***		
	Mean	**SD(range)**	**Mean**	**SD(range)**	***t***	**df**	***p***
Age	26.92	11.1(18-61)	27.11	9.64(19-59)	-0.083	57.2	0.934
Childhood income (likert 1-10)	5.07	1.98(1-8)	6.00	1.52(3-9)	-2.35	61.73	0.022
Years education							
Mother	15.13	3.41(5-20)	15.07	2.73(11-20)	0.086	61.8	0.931
Father	14.8	4.08 (0-20)	15.8	3.26(12-20)	-1.17	61.93	0.245
Self	14.7	2.15(9-21)	16.0	2.28(13-20)	-2.51	47.7	0.016*
Education self correlation with effort costs				**Correlation**	***t***	**df**	***p***
Cognitive effort cost, MDD group				-0.03	-0.24	50	0.809
Cognitive effort cost, all participants				0.09	0.80	77	0.427
Physical effort cost, MDD group				0.15	1.07	51	0.290
Physical effort cost, all participants)				0.06	0.53	78	0.599
	MDD		***Comparison***		***Group difference***		
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	χ^2	**df**	***p***
Gender					2.39	2	0.303
Female	38	63.3%	15	55.6%			
Male	19	31.7%	12	44.4%			
Non-binary	3	5%	0	0%			
Race					1.66	4	0.7999
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	0%	0	0%			
Asian	13	21.7%	8	29.6%			
Black or African American	8	13.3%	3	11.1%			
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%			
White	27	45%	13	48.1%			
Other or prefer not to say	6	10%	2	7.41%			
More than one race	6	10%	1	3.7%			
Ethnicity					1.41	2	0.495
Latino or Hispanic	8	13.3%	4	14.8%			
Not Latino or Hispanic	49	81.7%	23	85.2%			
Other or prefer not to say	3	5%	0	0%			
Total household income					9.44	7	0.222
Less than $25,000	12	20%	1	3.7%			
$25,000 to $34,999	7	11.7%	3	11.1%			
$35,000 to $49,999	8	13.3%	2	7.41%			
$50,000 to $74,999	9	15%	8	29.6%			
$75,000 to $99,999	5	8.33%	5	18.5%			
$100,000 to $149,999	6	10%	3	11.1%			
$150,000 to $199,999	0	0%	1	3.7%			
$200,000 or more	4	6.67%	2	7.41%			
Prefer not to answer	9	15%	2	7.41%			
Occupational status					9.64	7	0.209
Working full-time	9	15%	11	40.7%			

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

	MDD		*Comparison*		*Group difference*		
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	χ^2	**df**	***p***
Working part-time	7	11.7%	2	7.41%			
Student full-time	9	15%	3	11.1%			
Student part-time	3	5%	0	0%			
Working & student	21	35%	9	33.3%			
Homemaker	2	3.33%	0	0%			
Retired	0	0%	0	0%			
Volunteer worker	0	0%	0	0%			
Seeking employment	6	10%	2	7.41%			
Leave of absence	0	0%	0	0%			
Disabled (other free response)	3	5%	0	0%			
Relationship status					2.94	3	0.400
Single	48	80%	21	77.8%			
Married	2	3.33%	3	11.1%			
Divorced or separated	2	3.33%	0	0%			
Widowed	0	0%	0	0%			
Other	8	13.3%	3	11.1%			
Alcohol frequency					2.20	4	0.700
Never	15	25%	8	29.6%			
Monthly or less	14	23.3%	7	25.9%			
2-4 times a month	20	33.3%	5	18.5%			
2-3 times a week	9	15%	6	22.2%			
4 or more times a week	2	3.33%	1	3.7%			
Alcohol amount					2.46	4	0.651
0 (N/A)	15	25%	8	29.6%			
1 or 2	20	33.3%	10	37.0%			
3 or 4	16	26.7%	5	18.5%			
5 or 6	6	10.0%	4	14.8%			
7, 8, or 9	3	5.0%	0	0%			
10 or more	0	0%	0	0%			
Caffeine amount					2.59	4	0.623
None	15	25%	7	25.9%			
1 cup	29	48.3%	11	40.7%			
2-3 cups	13	21.7%	9	33.3%			
4-5 cups	2	3.33%	0	0%			
6 or more cups	1	1.67%	0	0%			
Tobacco					2.71	1	0.099
Uses tobacco	12	20%	1	3.7%			
Does not use tobacco	48	80%	26	96.3%			

Table S4: Diagnostic group differences in demographic factors. Column 1: demographic factor and response options. Continuous measures shown first with means (columns 2-3) and unpaired t-test statistics (columns 4-6, * indicates $p<0.05$). Years of education (self) was significantly different between groups, but not correlated with effort costs.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure S.2: Task behavior symptom heatmap. Left MDD group only, right all participants (spearman correlation matrix).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure S.3: MDD sample characteristics. Histogram, y-axis: proportion of MDD participants, x-axis: A: Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-5 severity rating, B: psychoactive medication drug class, C: Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression Total, D: Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale Total.



Figure S.4: Symptom severity by domain and diagnostic group. Histogram, bar color indicates diagnostic group.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Parameter	**Mean**	**Lower bound**	**Upper bound**	***p***
Inverse Temperature (log)	-1.15	-1.35	-0.95	<0.001
Cognitive Low Effort Travel Cost	133	117	150	<0.001
Cognitive Effort Cost	14.5	8.48	21.5	<0.001
Physical Low Effort Travel Cost	138.3	123.6	154.0	<0.001
Physical Effort Cost	15.1	7.41	22.9	<0.001
Cognitive vs. Physical Effort Cost Correlation	-0.039	-0.669	0.619	>0.450

Table S5: Group-level parameter posterior distribution values. Column 1: parameter, column 2: mean of the group-level posterior distribution, column 3: lower bound of 95% credible interval, column 4: upper bound of credible interval, column 5: Bayesian p-value.

Diagnostic group effect parameter	Mean	Lower	Upper	*p*
Cognitive Effort Cost	-0.73	-7.96	6.77	0.416
Physical Effort Cost	0.32	-7.78	8.71	0.470
Cognitive Low Effort Cost	1.44	-7.99	10.89	0.383
Physical Low Effort Cost	-2.27	-11.82	7.25	0.318
Inverse temperature (log)	-0.16	-0.51	0.22	0.190
Current depressed group effect parameter	Mean	Lower	Upper	*p*
Cognitive Effort Cost	-2.06	-9.51	5.64	0.292
Physical Effort Cost	0.60	-7.54	8.56	0.439
Cognitive Low Effort Cost	2.44	-6.75	11.63	0.303
Physical Low Effort Cost	-2.64	-12.28	6.71	0.293
Inverse temperature (log)	-0.12	-0.54	0.31	0.281

Table S6: Diagnostic group difference MVT model. Group effect parameter for model that included all MDD participants. Current depressed group effect parameter for model that excluded participants in remission.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure S.5: Model-agnostic change in exit threshold by diagnostic group. A: individual differences, error bars indicate 95% HDI, x-axis indicates cognitive effort condition, y-axis indicates physical effort condition. B: diagnostic group differences, x-axis indicates effort type and diagnostic group, y-axis indicates change in the exit threshold (high - low effort, apples).

1.7 MVT Model Results

1.8 Model-agnostic sensitivity to effort manipulation

The model-agnostic measure, change in exit threshold, showed that on average exit thresholds were lower in the cognitive, but not physical, high relative to low effort conditions (3-Back - 1-Back estimate=-0.361 apples, SE=0.103, df=80.59, t=-3.498, $p<0.001$; Larger - Smaller Number of Presses: -0.1809 apples, SE=0.1157, df = 81.541, t=-1.564, p=0.122). The MVT model group-level posterior parameters indicated high effort cost is greater than zero for both effort types, and cognitive and physical effort costs were not correlated in this sample, consistent with Experiment 2 of Bustamante et al. 2022 (Table S5). There was considerable individual variation in willingness to exert effort, signaling differences in perceived effort costs (see Figure 2). There was no reliable interaction between diagnostic group and change in exit threshold for cognitive (t=0.926, df=72.95, $p>0.357$) nor physical effort (t=0.097, df=76.84, $p>0.923$).

1.9 CCA

The CCA Figure S.6 yielded one significant dimension using the Wilks' Lambda asymptotic test for statistical significance of canonical correlation coefficients (Dimension 1 correlation=0.688, Wilks statistic=0.18, F-approx=1.66, df1=55, df2=207, p=0.006, Dimension 2 correlation=0.608, Wilks statistic=0.35, F-approx=1.37, df1=55, df2=172, p=0.085, Dimension 3 correlation=0.476, p=0.337, Dimension 4 correlation=0.463, p=0.412, Dimension 5 correlation=0.290, p=0.729 Menzel, 2022, using the p.asym function from the CCP package in R)).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Symptom	Estimate	SE	*t*	*p*	$p_{adjusted}$
A. Cognitive effort cost, current MDD participants					
Overall depression	-0.42	0.14	-2.94	0.006*	
Anhedonia	-2.82	1.59	-1.78	0.085	0.099
Anxiety	-4.78	1.29	-3.70	0.001	0.005*
Behavioral apathy	-2.65	1.01	-2.61	0.011	0.019*
Social apathy	-1.38	1.55	-0.89	0.378	0.378
Cognitive function symptoms	-2.54	1.37	-1.86	0.072	0.099
Depressed mood/suicidality	-4.32	1.50	-2.89	0.001	0.019*
Physical anergia/slowing	-4.43	1.63	-2.71	0.011	0.019*
B. Physical effort cost, current MDD participants					
Overall depression	0.16	0.33	0.49	0.630	
Anhedonia	8.60	3.19	2.70	0.011	0.077
Anxiety	1.06	3.16	0.34	0.739	0.739
Behavioral apathy	6.38	3.57	1.79	0.084	0.196
Social apathy	-1.68	3.06	-0.55	0.588	0.686
Cognitive function symptoms	7.02	3.04	2.31	0.027	0.094
Depressed mood/suicidality	4.58	3.20	1.43	0.163	0.285
Physical anergia/slowing	2.54	3.92	0.65	0.522	0.686
C. Cognitive effort cost, all participants					
Anhedonia	-0.97	1.02	-0.96	0.342	0.399
Anxiety	-2.42	0.88	-2.76	0.007	0.026*
Behavioral apathy	-2.65	1.01	-2.61	0.011	0.026*
Social apathy	-0.47	0.95	-0.49	0.624	0.624
Cognitive function symptoms	-1.57	0.80	-1.96	0.053	0.074
Depressed mood/suicidality	-2.70	1.03	-2.63	0.010	0.026*
Physical anergia/slowing	-2.25	0.98	-2.30	0.024	0.042*
D. Physical effort cost, all participants					
Anhedonia	7.25	2.30	3.16	0.002	0.014*
Anxiety	0.74	2.21	0.33	0.739	0.816
Behavioral apathy	3.62	2.52	1.43	0.156	0.448
Social apathy	0.52	2.22	0.23	0.816	0.816
Cognitive function symptoms	2.30	2.01	1.14	0.256	0.448
Depressed mood/suicidality	3.11	2.53	1.23	0.222	0.448
Physical anergia/slowing	1.62	2.52	0.64	0.521	0.729

Table S7: Symptoms effort cost regressions, current MDD only, and all participants. (A, current MDD, C, all participants) Predict cognitive effort cost by overall depression severity and each symptom domain, controlling for cognitive task performance (3-Back D') and age. (B, current MDD, D, all participants) Predict physical effort cost by overall depression severity, and each symptom domain, controlling for physical task performance (% larger number of presses completed), BMI, and age (* indicates $p<0.05$, FDR correction within symptom models).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure S.6: Canonical Correlation Analysis. MDD symptom intensity relationships to effort cost (MDD group only). The first dimension was significant, while all other dimensions were not. For the dimension 1 task coefficients, cognitive effort cost was positive, physical effort cost was negative, and 3-Back D' was positive. For the dimension 1 symptom coefficients behavioral apathy, need for cognition, anhedonia, and anxiety were all negative. This pattern suggests cognitive effort cost is negatively associated with symptom severity on this dimension, while physical effort cost is positively associated with symptom severity. The second dimension is displayed for completeness.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure S.7: Diagnostic group difference in travel task performance. A: 1-Back accuracy (D'), B: 1-Back Reaction Time (ms), C: 3-Back accuracy (D'), D: 3-Back Reaction Time (ms), E: percent of N-Back trials missed responding before the RT deadline, F: Physical low effort performance (percent completed smaller number of presses), G: Physical high effort performance (percent completed larger number of presses), H: Maximum number of presses determined in a calibration phase. There were no diagnostic group differences except that the MDD group responded faster on average on the cognitive (N-Back) task (A & C), and completed fewer presses in the high effort physical condition (G).

1.10 Additional task measures results

Across all the travel task measures tested we found few reliable diagnostic group differences (see Figure S.7 and Table S8), including no difference in missed N-Back trials, cognitive task accuracy (D'), nor required keypresses determined in the calibration phase. We found the MDD group responded faster on average on the cognitive (N-Back) task (Figure S.7). We found a significant effect of diagnostic group on percent of completed presses, in which the MDD group completed a larger percent of presses across conditions, but a significant diagnostic group by effort level interaction, in which the MDD group completed fewer presses. To decompose this effect, we ran the same regression separately for each effort level. There was no reliable group effect on the percent of smaller number of presses completed, but the MDD group completed a lower percent of required keypresses in the larger press condition.

We found that cognitive and physical effort costs were dissociable from task performance in the Effort Foraging Task, this may suggest a disconnect between effort selection and effort execution (as suggested in O'Reilly et al., 2014). There was no reliable association between cognitive effort cost and cognitive task performance (Figure 4, model 1: 3-Back D', $p>0.22$, 1-Back D', $p>0.79$, all participants, model 2: change D', $p>0.53$). Likewise, there was no reliable relationship between physical effort cost and the percent of key presses completed (model 3: larger number of presses, $p>0.91$, smaller number of presses, $p>0.20$, consistent with that was found in Culbreth et al., 2023).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.18.24302985; this version posted February 20, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Predicted variable	Predictor variable	Estimate	SE	df	*t*	*p*
N-Back missed trials (%)	Group	-0.021	0.495	77	-0.042	0.966
N-Back RT (log)	Group	-0.163	0.123	78.63	-1.35	0.181
N-Back RT (log)	Group*correct*N-Back	-0.197	0.084	4955	-2.335	0.020
N-Back RT (log)	Group*correct* target	-0.273	0.009	2450	-3.206	0.001
Accuracy (D')	Group	-0.008	0.222	113.6	-0.034	0.973
Accuracy (D')	Group*N-Back level	0.117	0.202	77	0.577	0.566
Required keypresses	Group	-2.00	3.640	77	-0.550	0.584
Completed presses (%)	Group	0.272	0.970	101	0.281	0.780
Completed presses (%)	Group*effort level	-2.379	0.675	3237.4	-3.524	0.0004
Completed larger presses	Group	-1.490	1.510	79.33	-0.987	0.327
Completed smaller presses	Group	-0.010	0.358	1650	-0.027	0.978

Table S8: Travel task performance diagnostic group differences. Column 1: predicted variable in regression, column 2: predictor variable, column 3: regression estimate, column 4: standard error (SE), column 5: degrees of freedom, column 6: t-statistic, column 7: p-value.

Overall depression was not related to cognitive task performance (Figure 4, predict Hamilton Rating Scale Total controlling for age by 3-Back D', $p>0.16$, 1-Back D', $p>0.86$) nor for physical task performance (predict Hamilton Rating Scale Total controlling for age and BMI by Larger number of presses, $p>0.073$, Smaller number of presses, $p>0.370$). While anxiety symptoms were associated with cognitive effort costs, they were not associated with cognitive task performance (MDD group predict by anxiety symptoms by 3-Back D', controlling for age, $p>0.21$, and 1-Back D', $p>0.79$). Anhedonia symptoms were related to the percent of smaller number of presses completed ($t=2.70$, $p<0.010$) but not to the percent of larger number of presses ($p>0.318$).

Symptom	Estimate	SE	*t*	*p*	$p_{adjusted}$
A. Overall exit threshold, current MDD					
Overall depression	-0.04	0.01	-2.68	0.011*	
Anhedonia	-0.32	0.16	-1.96	0.058	0.081
Anxiety	-0.34	0.15	-2.31	0.027	0.047*
Behavioral apathy	-0.43	0.18	-2.39	0.022	0.047*
Social apathy	-0.15	0.15	-0.98	0.332	0.332
Cognitive function symptoms	-0.16	0.15	-1.08	0.287	0.332
Depressed mood/suicidality	-0.45	0.15	-2.97	0.005	0.037*
Physical anergia/slowing	-0.44	0.17	-2.59	0.014	0.047*
B. Overall exit threshold, all participants					
Anhedonia	-0.06	0.10	-0.60	0.551	0.551
Anxiety	-0.15	0.09	-1.67	0.098	0.172
Behavioral apathy	-0.19	0.10	-1.86	0.067	0.162
Social apathy	-0.07	0.09	-0.70	0.487	0.551
Cognitive function symptoms	-0.12	0.08	-1.47	0.147	0.205
Depressed mood/suicidality	-0.23	0.10	-2.26	0.026	0.162
Physical anergia/slowing	-0.18	0.10	-1.84	0.069	0.162

Table S9: Overall exit threshold relationship to symptoms (current MDD group, and all participants). Predicting individual differences in overall exit thresholds (log, from low effort conditions) by overall depression severity, and each symptom domain, controlling for age (* indicates $p<0.05$, FDR correction within symptom models).