fDepression in Premanifest Huntington's Disease: Effective Connectivity of Striatum and Default Mode Network

Tamrin Barta,[1] Leonardo Novelli[1], Nellie Georgiou-Karistianis[1], Julie Stout[1], Samantha Loi[2,3], Yifat Glikmann-Johnston[1], and Adeel Razi[1,4,5,6]

Abstract

Depression is one of the most common and impactful features in premanifest Huntington's disease (HD). Depression is increasingly being conceptualised as a dysconnection syndrome and two large-scale networks surmised to contribute to the expression of depressive symptoms in premanifest HD are the striatum and the default mode network. Existing neuroimaging studies are limited and relied on functional connectivity: an inherently undirected measure of connectivity. Dynamic causal modelling allows testing of neurobiologically plausible models of connectivity changes in pre-specified networks. We investigated default mode network and striatal effective connectivity and depression in premanifest HD, using these model-based methods.

We analysed 3T resting state fMRI data from 93 premanifest HD participants (51.6% females; M_{age} = 42.7). Behavioural measures included history of depression, Beck Depression Inventory, 2nd Edition (BDI-II) and Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, depression subscale (HADS-D). A cut-off score recommended for use in HD categorised clinically significant depressive symptoms. Regions of interest (ROIs) included medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate, hippocampus, caudate, and putamen. Each ROI time series was calculated as the first principal component of the voxels' activity within an 8 mm sphere for medial prefrontal cortex and posterior cingulate and a 6 mm sphere for all other regions and was further constrained within

masks. Spectral dynamic causal modelling was used to estimate subject-level connectivity and parametric empirical bayes was employed to estimate group-level effective connectivity between participants with self-report depression history and those without. Leave-one-out cross-validation was performed for connections that reached this criterion.

Model estimation was excellent, with average variance-explained of 89.70%. Having a depression diagnosis was associated with aberrant excitatory influence of both posterior and anterior DMN to hippocampi and striatal areas. No aberrant connections were found from medial prefrontal cortex to caudate or posterior cingulate. The present study demonstrates that aberrant connectivity patterns for premanifest HD with a history of depression is associated with coupling differences in depressive symptoms. Leave-one-out cross-validation accurately predicted clinically elevated depressive symptoms. Correct classification reached significance for HADS-D cut-off scores, $corr(91) = -0.29$: $p = 0.002$, and BDI-II scores, $corr(91) = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$.

These findings suggest network dysconnection as a neural basis for depression in premanifest HD. Aberrant effective connections were associated with self-reported depression history, which was differentially associated with coupling changes in depressive symptoms. This adds to our understanding of the pathophysiology of HD and suggests defining functional networks of neuropsychiatric features plays an important role in understanding the disease.

Author affiliations:

1 Turner Institute of Brain and Mental Health at the School of Psychological Sciences, and, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, Monash University

2 Department of Psychiatry, University of Melbourne.

3 Neuropsychiatry Centre, Royal Melbourne Hospital, Parkville, Australia

4 Monash Biomedical Imaging, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia

5 Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging, University College London, London, United Kingdom

6 CIFAR Azrieli Global Scholars Program, CIFAR, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Correspondence to: Tamrin Barta

Full address

Tamrin.barta@monash.edu

Running title: Depression in Premanifest HD: Striatum and DMN

Keywords: Huntington's disease; neurodegeneration; depression; brain connectivity; functional MRI; resting-state

1.0 Introduction

Incidence rates for depression are higher early in Huntington's Disease (HD), in the premanifest period, years before the onset of clinically significant motor deficits.[1,2] Despite the well-established aetiology for HD, the pathophysiology of depression remains poorly understood.

The pathophysiology of depression in premanifest HD is likely heterogeneous and complex, involving psychosocial factors and neuropathological features. HD gene-expansion carriers (HDGECs) show subtle changes in mood during the premanifest period compared to first-degree relatives without the expansion.[3–5] Further, premanifest HDGECs report greater depressive symptoms and higher rates of depressive disorders when compared to at-risk people without the gene expansion, even when blinded to their HD gene-expansion status.[6] This means that, when accounting for shared psychosocial experiences and same perception of risk, premanifest

HDGECs are more likely to report elevated depressive symptoms, suggesting a potential neuropathological process underpinning depression.

The neuropathological hallmark of HD is atrophy of the striatum,[7] which has been linked to depression in non-neurological populations.[8–10] Despite documented degeneration of the striatum in premanifest HD,[11] there lacks evidence that depression is causally related to neurodegeneration of the striatum. The dorsal striatum—comprising the caudate nucleus and putamen—is a core part of canonical frontostriatal circuits,[12] which show aberrant functional connectivity in depression,[8] including attenuation proportionate to depression severity,[10] as well as volumetric changes.[13–16] The dorsal striatum can be considered a disease-specific area of advanced atrophy in HD.[17,18] The makeup of frontostriatal circuits means disruption at any point can result in dysfunction of the entire circuit, suggesting increased vulnerability to depression in HD.

Depression is conceptualised as a dysconnection syndrome, resulting from abnormal interactions between spatially distributed brain networks rather than localized dysfunction of a region.[12,19–21] The default mode network (DMN) is one prominent functional network associated with depression, and comprises an anterior hub—typically the medial prefrontal cortex (MPFC)—and posterior hub—typically the posterior cingulate cortex (PCC).[22,23] The DMN is considered a reliable neural marker of major depression in non-neurological populations,[12] including increased functional connectivity in anterior DMN, altered functional connectivity between anterior and posterior DMN,[24] and increased effective connectivity from anterior to posterior DMN.[25] Additionally, the hippocampus is often considered a subsystem of the DMN[24] and is associated with major depression.[26] For example, greater functional hypoconnectivity between left hippocampus and PCC and greater hyperconnectivity between right hippocampus and

prefrontal cortices is demonstrated in remitted late-onset depression.[27] Hippocampal degeneration has emerged as a significant factor in depression in other movement disorders, including Parkinson's disease (PD). In PD, depression is associated with reduced bilateral hippocampus volume,[28] functional dysconnection in the left hippocampus,[29] and aberrant functional connectivity between PCC and hippocampus.[30] Both PD and HD are neurodegenerative motor disorders marked by cardinal motor and non-motor symptoms, with depression rates exceeding the general population[31]; it is plausible similar mechanisms underpin depression in both diseases.

Research in major depression suggests brain connectivity changes within our proposed network, comprising the DMN and dorsal striatum, could play a substantial role in the manifestation of depression in premanifest HD. Notably, white matter architecture changes and grey matter volume reductions, within both the DMN and striatum, distinguish people with and without major depression.[32] Major depression has been linked to aberrant functional connectivity within the striatum and frontal cortex,[33] between the striatum and the PCC,[34] and hyperconnectivity within the DMN, including hippocampus, has extended to networks including the caudate.[35] These findings demonstrate functional dysconnection in depression and point to a role in the manifestation of depressive symptoms in premanifest HD. Within the HD literature, diffusion tractography has demonstrated depressive symptoms in premanifest HD correlate with increased functional connectivity and decreased structural connectivity for the DMN and striatum, [36] as well as reduced cortical thickness in the DMN and frontostriatal network, including the prefrontal cortex and PCC, across premanifest and manifest HD.[37] Taking the threads of the literature together, structural and functional changes help explain the relationship between

depression and neurodegeneration in HD, and support the idea that large-scale dysconnection of the DMN and dorsal striatum may contribute to depressive symptoms in premanifest HD.

Research investigating neuropathology of depressive symptoms in HD is limited, with the literature largely relying on functional connectivity analyses, a correlation-based measure that reflects dependencies between spatially remote regions.[38,39] Functional connectivity is calculated from the blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) signal, which is comprised of neural, hemodynamic—such as cerebral blood flow (CBF)—and noise components. Ageing and neurodegenerative processes differentially impact these components of the BOLD signal,[40,41] including hypoperfusion of CBF early in HD: which is reduced to half in frontotemporal and cingulate regions.[42] Consequently, functional connectivity analyses may erroneously identify differences in functional MRI (fMRI) signals due to CBF as neuronal differences.[40] Effective connectivity overcomes this as a model-based, biophysically informed measure that infers the directed influence one neural system exerts over another, disentangling the contribution of neuronal and neurovascular mechanisms on the measured BOLD signal.[41] We applied spectral dynamic causal modelling (spectral DCM), a popular method for inferring effective connectivity using resting-state fMRI data. DCM measures the direction and strength of connectivity among brain regions using Bayesian model fitting and discriminates between inhibition and excitation of both bottom-up and top-down connections, allowing for inference of directed connectivity between brain regions and a within brain region (inhibitory) self-connectivity (i.e., synaptic activity).[43,44] Further, the framework allows for the inference of associations between changes in effective connectivity and behavioural measures.[45]

In this study, we investigated whether changes in DMN and striatal effective connectivity underpin the expression of depressive symptoms in premanifest HD, using neurobiologically

plausible model-based methods. We hypothesised stronger effective connectivity from MPFC to PCC and hippocampus for participants with a history of depression compared to those without. We further hypothesised less effective connectivity from the MPFC to putamen and caudate for participants with a history of depression compared to those without. We hypothesize that DMN and striatal effective connectivity changes associated with increased current depression symptoms is a marker of brain connectivity that underlies increased depressive symptoms in premanifest HDGECs.

2.0 Materials and methods

2.1 Participants

This study used data from Track-On HD, which was approved by local ethics committees at all four participating sites—Leiden (Netherlands), London (United Kingdom), Paris (France), and Vancouver (Canada) —and has been reported in Klöppel et al. (2015) and Tabrizi et al. (2009). Participants provided written informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.[46,47] After excluding participants who did not have complete behavioural and imaging data, baseline clinical and imaging data from 93 premanifest HDGECs (48 female, M_{age} = 42.67, *SD* = 9.50) were included in the study. All premanifest HDGECs had a cytosine, adenine, guanine (CAG) repeat length ≥ 39 and a disease burden score ≥179. Although most participants were aged between 18 and 65 years, some participants were aged 65 years or older as participation carried over from the preceding Track-HD project. Track-On HD's exclusion criteria included major psychiatric, neurological, or medical conditions, and a history of severe head injury.[46] Participants were categorised into two groups based on whether they reported a previous diagnosis of depression at enrolment.

2.2 Clinical Measures

Track-On HD included a comprehensive neuropsychiatric battery, including psychiatric history, medication use, and history of suicidality at the time of enrolment. The present study includes concomitant mood medication use, including atypical antipsychotics, benzodiazepines, sodium valproate, serotonin–norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, and tricyclic and tetracyclic antidepressants, as well as other atypical medications such as hydroxyzine, lamotrigine, and mianserin. These medications were used for a variety of reasons, including anxiety, bipolar affective disorder, depression, irritability, low mood, nervousness, panic disorder, and post-traumatic stress disorder. Even if used for reasons unrelated to mood, such as headaches, mood medication use was recorded to control for any potential unprescribed effects on mood.

2.2.1 Mood Measures

Two self-report measures were used to capture depressive symptoms: the Beck Depression Inventory, 2nd Edition (BDI-II)[48] and the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, Depression Subscale (HADS-D).[49,50] The BDI-II is a 21-item self-report measure, using a 4-point Likert scale, with a maximum score of 63, assessing depressive symptoms over a two-week period.[48] Research has recommended the use of the BDI-II in HD, based on psychometric evaluation of 52 rating scales used across HD studies.[51] An optimal cut-off score of 10/11 discriminates clinically significant depression, with corresponding sensitivity of 1.00 and specificity of 0.66.[52] The HADS-D uses a 4-point Likert scale from 0–3, with a maximum score of 21.[49,50] Research in HD populations suggests an optimal cut-off of 6/7 for the HADS-D to discriminate clinically significant depression with excellent sensitivity, 1.00, and good specificity, 0.82.[52] These cut-off scores were used to classify current clinically meaningful depressive symptoms.

2.2.2 HD-related Measures

Three HD-related measures were included. The Unified Huntington's Disease Rating Scale (UHDRS) Total Motor Score (TMS) is a clinician-rated assessment of the severity of motor signs in HD, consisting of 15 items—including chorea and dystonia—with a maximum possible score of 124.[53] The CAG-Age Product (CAP) score model the interaction of age and CAG repeat length on disease progression, whereby a CAP score is equal to 100 at the expected age of diagnosis.[54–57] The CAP Score is not diagnostic, and therefore HDGECs can have a score greater than 100 and still be in the premanifest period. The Disease Burden Score (DBS) is a posteriori index of the pathology burden due to lifetime exposure to the abnormal huntingtin protein.[56] The DBS models the impact of age and CAG repeat, and includes a constant of 35.5, the largest number of CAG repeats where no HD pathology is expected to develop.[56]

2.3 Statistical Analyses

2.3.1 Participant Demographics

Demographic variables between groups were compared using either Pearson's Chi-squared test for categorical variables or Linear Model ANOVA. Assumptions were met for both analyses. For Pearson's Chi-squared tests, data used were nominal or ordinal, mutually exclusive, and groups were independent. For the Linear Model ANOVA, visual inspection of a Q-Q plot of the residuals for normality, and a boxplot of Residuals by group to assess the assumptions of independence and constant variance was undertaken. See supplementary material for all plots. Some variables—i.e., BDI-II scores, UHDRS TMS scores, and HADS-D scores—demonstrated signs of having non-normal residual distributions; this was considered acceptable as the sample

size was relatively large and the results of the Linear Model ANOVA did not impact the main outcomes of the study, i.e., the spectral DCM analysis.

2.3.2 Data Acquisition and Pre-processing

3T MRI data were acquired on two different scanner systems and at four different sites: Philips Achieva (in Vancouver and Leiden) and Siemens TIM Trio (in London and Paris), as described in in Klöppel et al. (2015) and Tabrizi et al. (2009). Pre-processing was performed using FMRIPREP v21.02.2[58,59] and MRIQC v0.15.2,[60] using FreeSurfer v-6.0.1.[61] In brief, the pipeline included slice-timing correction, realignment, spatial normalisation to Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space, and spatial smoothing by a 6 mm full-width half-maximum Gaussian kernel. See supplementary material for full outline of acquisition procedures for structural and functional imaging and the pre-processing pipeline.

2.3.3 Selection and Extraction of Volumes of Interest

The selection of regions of interest (ROIs) and their size were based on previous research[62,63] and Neurosynth, an automated synthesis of functional neuroimaging data[64]. Masks for the 8 ROIs were chosen using the WFU PickAtlas[65] for the PCC, hippocampus, caudate, and putamen, and the Stanford Willard Atlas[66] for the MPFC. The pre-processed data underwent smoothing, and a generalized linear model (GLM) was used to regress out white matter and cerebrospinal fluid signals, as well as 6 head motion parameters (3 translation and 3 rotational). The time series for each ROI was calculated as the first principal component of the voxels' activity within an 8 mm sphere for the larger regions (i.e., MPFC and PCC) and a 6 mm sphere for all other regions. Boundaries of the masks constrained the spheres that were centred on the MNI coordinates, listed in Table 1.

2.3.4. Dynamic Causal Modelling

Effective connectivity was estimated using estimated using spectral DCM. Spectral DCM employs a linear state-space model (a model that explicitly separates the neuronal activity and the observed BOLD signal) to fit the cross-spectral densities of the observed BOLD signal. These data features are closely related to the correlation functions but are defined in the frequency domain, ensuring computational efficiency when inverting large-scale brain networks.[67]

In this study, a fully connected within-subject DCM model with no exogenous inputs (resting-state analysis) was specified for each participant using ROIs for the striatum and DMN. After specification, the model was inverted by fitting the DCM forward model (i.e., its parameters) to provide the best prediction for the observed cross spectral densities. For each subject, spectral DCM estimates the effective connectivity strength between each pair of ROIs and the corresponding uncertainty of each estimate.

The inferred effective connectivity from the first-level analysis (individual subjects) was used for hypothesis testing of between-subjects' effects. Covariates included in the between-subjects design matrix included use of mood medications, sex, and the first principal component of between scanner effects (see supplementary materials for more details), to account for the use of two scanner types across sites. The Parametric Empirical Bayes (PEB) framework was used to estimate group means and the effect of a previous history of depression for each connection.[45] The PEB procedure assesses within-subject connections in relation to group means, accounting for the expected connection strength, the covariance of connectivity parameters, and the unexplained (between-subject) noise. In doing so, precise parameter estimates with less noise are upweighted compared to uncertain estimates with more noise. Lastly, Bayesian model reduction

was employed as an efficient form of Bayesian model selection.[45] Specifically, we focused on connections that had a free energy ≥ 0.99 (see supplementary Table 1 for all significant effective connections.) Self-connections in DCM can be thought of as modulators controlling the balance between excitation and inhibition, and neurobiologically explained as increasing or decreasing the decay of synaptic activity.[44] More information about self-connectivity in DCM is available in the supplementary materials.

Finally, leave-one-out cross-validation was performed for each individual connection that reached the significance criterion—free energy ≥ 99%□—from the second level (between-subjects) effective connectivity analysis. The ability to correctly classify the left-out participant as reaching the BDI-II and HADS-D classification cut-off was assessed.

2.4 Data availability

No new data were collected for this article. The data that support the findings of this study are available on the Enroll-HD platform via request at https://www.enroll-hd.org/for-researchers/access-data-biosamples/.

3.0 Results

3.1 General characteristics of participant groups

The two groups—classified by previous self-reported history of depression—did not differ significantly in terms of sex, age, handedness, or any HD-related variables. However, premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression differed from those without a history of depression in current use of mood medication, and both mean BDI-II and HADS-D scores. Participant characteristics are summarised in Table 2.

3.2 Accuracy of DCM model estimation

The estimation of DCM models for individual participants in both groups was excellent. Average percentage variance-explained by DCM model estimation across participants, fitted to the observed cross spectra data, was 89.70% (SD: 4.22; range: 74.15-94.87). See Supplementary Fig. 10 for visualisation of the variance-explained across participants.

3.3 Network Effective Connectivity Change of the DMN and Striatum

Effective connectivity within and between the DMN and striatum was analysed between premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression and those without a history of depression. Only connections that exceeded the significance criterion—free energy ≥ 99%—for inference with very strong evidence are reported. Fig. 1 details regional effective connectivity change between groups.

We found several changes in group level effective connectivity of the DMN between participants with and without a history of depression. Participants with a history of depression showed decreased self-connectivity of the right hippocampus and decreased connectivity from right hippocampus to PCC, but increased connectivity from right hippocampus to MPFC. Additionally, participants with depression showed increased average effective connectivity from PCC to right hippocampus and decreased self-connectivity of the PCC. Finally, participants with depression showed decreased average effective connectivity from MPFC to right hippocampus compared to those without a history of depression.

HDGECs with a history of depression showed increased group level self-connectivity of left caudate and right putamen. Moreover, there was an increase in group level effective connectivity

from left putamen to left caudate, and a decrease in connectivity from left putamen to right putamen in premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression compared to premanifest HDGECs without a history of depression.

Premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression showed decreased group level effective connectivity from the left caudate to the left hippocampus and from PCC to right putamen. Conversely, there was an increase in group level effective connectivity from both MPFC and PCC to left caudate, as well as increased connectivity from PCC to left putamen for premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression compared to participants without a history of depression.

3.4 Brain-behaviour Associations

3.4.1 DMN and Striatal Effective Connectivity Changes Associated With HADS-D State Depressive Symptoms

Decreased self-inhibition of left caudate, left putamen and PCC, right to left putamen inhibition, left caudate to left hippocampus inhibition, PCC to right putamen inhibition and right hippocampus to PCC excitation was associated with HADS-D cut-off scores for clinically meaningful depressive symptoms for premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression. Conversely, decreased self-inhibition of the PCC, right to left putamen inhibition, PCC and MPCF to left putamen excitation, and PCC to right hippocampus inhibition was associated with HADS-D cut-off scores for premanifest HDGECs without a history of depression. Fig. 2 shows effective connectivity changes associated with HADS-D clinical cut-off scores for premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression and those without a history of depression.

3.4.2 DMN and Striatal Effective Connectivity Changes Associated With BDI-II State Depressive Symptoms

Decreased self-inhibition of left caudate, left putamen and PCC, left caudate to right hippocampus inhibition, PCC to left caudate and right hippocampus connectivity inhibition and right hippocampus to PCC excitation was associated with BDI-II cut-off scores for clinically meaningful depressive symptoms for premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression. Conversely, increased self-connectivity of left PU and decreased self-connectivity of PCC, left putamen to left caudate inhibition, right to left PU inhibition, right hippocampus to PCC excitation and PCC inhibition to both right putamen and right hippocampus was associated with BDI-II cut-off scores for premanifest HDGECs without a history of depression. Fig. 3 shows effective connectivity changes associated with BDI-II clinical cut-off scores for premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression and those without a history of depression.

3.5 Connectivity Drivers of Depressive Symptoms: Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

Leave-one-out cross-validation was performed using the self-connection of the PCC. The PCC was chosen as it appeared most consistently across all models of effective connectivity changes associated with both HADS-D and BDI-II clinical cut-off scores. Furthermore, the dorsal striatum represented a region that is associated with disease-specific and depression-specific changes, while the DMN, and here the PCC, is positioned as a depression-related region only. Using this connection alone, correct classification of the left-out participant reached significance for both HADS-D cut-off scores, $corr(91) = -0.29$: $p = 0.002$, and BDI-II cut-off scores, $corr(91) = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$.

Cross-validation was performed on all significant individual connections, DMN regions, and a network of DMN and dorsal striatum regions, that exceeded the significance criterion—free energy ≥ 99%—are reported in the supplementary materials.

4.0 Discussion

We used spectral DCM to investigate large-scale network dysfunction associated with depressive symptoms in premanifest HD. For premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression, we found excitatory projections from the MPFC to the right hippocampus and left putamen, in line with our hypotheses. The PCC had aberrant excitatory and inhibitory influence on the striatum and hippocampus for participants with a history of depression, compared to those without. Contrary to hypotheses, no aberrant connections were found from MPFC to the caudate or PCC. The present study demonstrates that differences in network connectivity for premanifest HDGECs with history of depression is associated with coupling differences in current depressive symptoms, compared to those without a history of depression. The results of the leave-one-out validation analysis imply that, estimates of effective connectivity accurately predict whether a premanifest HDGEC has clinically elevated depressive symptoms, without using information about their self-reported depression history. Overall, our findings reconcile evidence from both the depression and HD literature regarding functional connectivity changes in the striatum and DMN.

4.1 Hippocampal Dysconnection and Depression

This is the first study, to our knowledge, to establish a link between alterations in hippocampal connectivity and the presence of depressive symptoms in premanifest HD. Interestingly, the

present findings suggest reciprocal increased excitatory influence of the MPFC and hippocampus, contrary to the major depression literature.[68] In keeping with existing findings in non-neurological populations, there is a propensity for right hippocampal involvement.[27,68] The present findings are in keeping with findings in the PD depression literature, with aberrant self-connectivity of right hippocampus and bidirectional aberrant connectivity between PCC and right hippocampus for premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression. Additionally, aberrant connectivity between PCC and right hippocampus was associated with clinically elevated levels of depressive symptoms on the BDI-II. Our results build on the existing literature to demonstrate bidirectional connectivity changes between PCC and right hippocampus for premanifest HDGECs with a history of depression. These findings support hippocampal dysconnection in depression in movement disorders, and existing research in PD complements our findings of hippocampus involvement in the circuitopathy of depression in premanifest HD.

4.2 The Role of Medial Prefrontal Cortex in Depression

Perhaps the most striking and unexpected finding is the relatively limited influence of the MPFC in our models. This finding may be attributed to inconsistencies in designating specific areas within the prefrontal cortex as markers of depression. Both the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) and the orbitofrontal cortex have also been explored as potential anterior hubs of the DMN associated with depression. The division of the MPFC into ventral and dorsal regions is common, with no clear consensus on a precise definition or number of subdivisions.[69] For instance, both the orbitofrontal cortex and vmPFC have been implicated as core neuropathological regions in different depression subtypes.[70] Moreover, the MPFC and vmPFC together have been linked to self-referential processes in depression,[71] while models of the anterior DMN have incorporated contributions from the orbitofrontal, ventromedial, and

dorsomedial cortices.[72] It is possible that our study did not capture enough voxels to catch MPFC involvement. Though, further analyses found that excitatory influence of the MPFC on the PCC and disinhibition of the MPFC for both groups cancelled each other out at the group level (see supplementary materials). Hence, it is plausible that depression in HD is driven by changes in the posterior DMN or that the consistently observed hyperconnectivity in the anterior DMN necessitates the inclusion of a larger network of anterior regions, often encompassing the anterior cingulate cortex.[72,73] Further research should explore these findings, as it may present as a neuropathological feature present in depression in HD that distinguishes it from depression in non-neurological populations.

Additionally, depression history was qualified based on self-report whereby participants elected if they had a previous depression diagnosis.[44,46,47] It is possible that the self-report of participants did not accurately capture those who met current criteria for major depression. Additionally, measuring psychiatric changes in HD is complex. Most clinical criteria include somatic items that could be confounded by the neurodegenerative process' effect on functional capacities, such as sleep and psychomotor changes.[74] It is likely that the HADS-D has better sensitivity and specificity compared to the BDI-II because it has only one somatic item.[52] Somatic features of depression, including sleep disturbance and weight loss, do not discriminate well between nondepressed and depressed premanifest HDGECs, as these can be symptoms of HD unrelated to depression.[75] However, the HADS-D omits important non-somatic items for assessing depression, including suicidality.[52] Interestingly, endorsed depressive symptoms by HDGECs are largely consistent standard diagnostic criteria.[75] A combination of both measures was therefore used to account for discrepant symptom measurement across scales, with clinical cut-off scores used. We chose this approach as the most clinically meaningful application for screening current

depressive symptoms, given that cut-offs were derived in comparison to diagnoses using gold-standard psychiatric interviews. Despite these procedures, it remains possible that depression in our sample was not fully captured, which could account for differences in MPFC involvement in our study.

4.3 Limitations and Future Directions

While this study demonstrates a relationship between brain network dysconnection and depression in premanifest HD, key questions remain. Firstly, the temporal pattern of depression in HD and its connection with disease progression remains contentious, as neuropsychiatric syndromes tend to fluctuate over the course of HD.[1,76] As this study exclusively uses baseline data for premanifest HDGECs, it cannot provide insights into the pathophysiology of depressive symptoms across disease progression into the manifest period, a critical concern since depression appears to be most common in late premanifest and early manifest HD.[1,76] Intriguingly, the severity of depressive symptoms appears unrelated to HD disease progression.[1,2,4,77,78] Some suggest that increasing depression from premanifest to manifest HD is linked to cognitive and motor changes rather than disease duration.[79] The fluctuating temporal pattern of depression in HD may be explained by changes in functional and structural coupling over the course of HD. Structural and functional connectivity may weaken due to neurodegeneration and white matter injury in surrounding fibre tracts.[80] In HD, stronger structural connectivity has been associated with weaker functional activity—and vice versa—and an antero–posterior dissociation of changes in functional connectivity in premanifest HD.[81] Do depressive symptoms predict a breakdown or increase in the relationship between structure and function? There remains an unresolved question about structural connectivity aberration and its potential constraint on effective connectivity in depression in HD.

This study suggests large scale network disconnection as a neural basis for depression in premanifest HD. Aberrant effective connections were associated with self-reported history depression, which was differentially associated with coupling changes in depressive symptoms. Depressive symptoms in premanifest HD have been associated with poorer independent functioning [82], greater suicidal behaviour,[83] and cognitive impairments, including executive dysfunction, attentional difficulties, and processing speed inefficiencies.[84,85] Our findings add to our understanding of the pathophysiology of HD, and suggests defining functional brain networks of neuropsychiatric features, including depression, plays important roles in understanding the disease process.

5.0 Funding

AR and LN are funded by the Australian Research Council (DP200100757) and AR by Australian National Health and Medical Research Council Investigator Grant (Ref: 1194910). AR is affiliated with The Wellcome Centre for Human Neuroimaging supported by core funding from Wellcome [203147/Z/16/Z]. AR is a CIFAR Azrieli Global Scholar in the Brain, Mind, and Consciousness Program.6.0 Competing interests

The authors report no competing interests.

7.0 Supplementary material

Supplementary material is available at *Brain* online.

8.0 References

1. Epping EA, Paulsen JS. Depression in the early stages of Huntington disease. *Neurodegener Dis Manag*. 2011;1(5):407-414. doi:10.2217/nmt.11.45

2. Pla P, Orvoen S, Saudou F, David DJ, Humbert S. Mood disorders in Huntington's disease: from behavior to cellular and molecular mechanisms. *Front Behav Neurosci*. 2014;8(135). Accessed March 10, 2022. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00135

3. Duff K, Paulsen JS, Beglinger LJ, Langbehn DR, Stout JC. Psychiatric Symptoms in Huntington's Disease before Diagnosis: The Predict-HD Study. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2007;62(12):1341-1346. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.11.034

4. Kingma EM, van Duijn E, Timman R, van der Mast RC, Roos RAC. Behavioural problems in Huntington's disease using the Problem Behaviours Assessment. *General Hospital Psychiatry*. 2008;30(2):155-161. doi:10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2007.11.005

5. van Duijn E, Kingma EM, Timman R, et al. Cross-Sectional Study on Prevalences of Psychiatric Disorders in Mutation Carriers of Huntington's Disease Compared With Mutation-Negative First-Degree Relatives. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2008;69(11):3949.

6. Julien CL, Thompson JC, Wild S, et al. Psychiatric disorders in preclinical Huntington's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2007;78(9):939-943. doi:10.1136/jnnp.2006.103309

7. Ross CA, Tabrizi SJ. Huntington's disease: from molecular pathogenesis to clinical treatment. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2011;10(1):83-98. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(10)70245-3

8. Cheng W, Rolls ET, Qiu J, et al. Medial reward and lateral non-reward orbitofrontal cortex circuits change in opposite directions in depression. *Brain*. 2016;139(12):3296-3309. doi:10.1093/brain/aww255

9. Der-Avakian A, Markou A. The neurobiology of anhedonia and other reward-related deficits. *Trends in Neurosciences*. 2012;35(1):68-77. doi:10.1016/j.tins.2011.11.005

10. Satterthwaite TD, Kable JW, Vandekar L, et al. Common and Dissociable Dysfunction of the Reward System in Bipolar and Unipolar Depression. *Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2015;40(9):2258-2268. doi:10.1038/npp.2015.75

11. Georgiou-Karistianis N, Gray MA, Domínguez D JF, et al. Automated differentiation of pre-diagnosis Huntington's disease from healthy control individuals based on quadratic discriminant analysis of the basal ganglia: The IMAGE-HD study. *Neurobiology of Disease*. 2013;51:82-92. doi:10.1016/j.nbd.2012.10.001

12. Li B, Friston K, Mody M, Wang HN, Lu HB, Hu DW. A brain network model for depression: From symptom understanding to disease intervention. *CNS Neuroscience & Therapeutics*. 2018;24(11):1004-1019. doi:10.1111/cns.12998

13. Bora E, Harrison BJ, Davey CG, Yücel M, Pantelis C. Meta-analysis of volumetric abnormalities in cortico-striatal-pallidal-thalamic circuits in major depressive disorder. *Psychological Medicine*. 2012;42(4):671-681. doi:10.1017/S0033291711001668

14. Gong Q, He Y. Depression, Neuroimaging and Connectomics: A Selective Overview. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2015;77(3):223-235. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.08.009

15. Kim MJ, Hamilton JP, Gotlib IH. Reduced caudate gray matter volume in women with major depressive disorder. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging*. 2008;164(2):114-122. doi:10.1016/j.pscychresns.2007.12.020

16. Pizzagalli DA, Holmes AJ, Dillon DG, et al. Reduced Caudate and Nucleus Accumbens Response to Rewards in Unmedicated Individuals With Major Depressive Disorder. *AJP*. 2009;166(6):702-710. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2008.08081201

17. Tabrizi SJ, Reilmann R, Roos RA, et al. Potential endpoints for clinical trials in premanifest and early Huntington's disease in the TRACK-HD study: analysis of 24 month observational data. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2012;11(1):42-53. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(11)70263-0

18. Wilson H, Dervenoulas G, Politis M. Chapter Nine - Structural Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Huntington's Disease. In: Politis M, ed. *International Review of Neurobiology*. Vol 142. Imaging in Movement Disorders: Imaging in Atypical Parkinsonism and Familial Movement Disorders. Academic Press; 2018:335-380. doi:10.1016/bs.irn.2018.09.006

19. Friston KJ. The disconnection hypothesis. *Schizophrenia Research*. 1998;30(2):115-125. doi:10.1016/S0920-9964(97)00140-0

20. Hannan AJ. Synaptopathy, circuitopathy and the computational biology of Huntington's disease. *BMC Biology*. 2018;16(1):71. doi:10.1186/s12915-018-0539-y

21. Friston KJ, Frith CD. Schizophrenia: a disconnection syndrome? *Clin Neurosci*. 1995;3(2):89-97.

22. Guo W, Liu F, Zhang J, et al. Abnormal Default-Mode Network Homogeneity in First-Episode, Drug-Naive Major Depressive Disorder. *PLOS ONE*. 2014;9(3):e91102. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0091102

23. Li B, Liu L, Friston KJ, et al. A Treatment-Resistant Default Mode Subnetwork in Major Depression. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2013;74(1):48-54. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.11.007

24. Mulders PC, van Eijndhoven PF, Schene AH, Beckmann CF, Tendolkar I. Resting-state functional connectivity in major depressive disorder: A review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2015;56:330-344. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.07.014

25. Li L, Li B, Bai Y, et al. Abnormal resting state effective connectivity within the default mode network in major depressive disorder: A spectral dynamic causal modeling study. *Brain and Behavior*. 2017;7(7):e00732. doi:10.1002/brb3.732

26. Figueroa CA, Mocking RJT, van Wingen G, Martens S, Ruhé HG, Schene AH. Aberrant default-mode network-hippocampus connectivity after sad memory-recall in remitted-depression. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*. 2017;12(11):1803-1813. doi:10.1093/scan/nsx108

27. Wang Z, Yuan Y, Bai F, et al. Altered functional connectivity networks of hippocampal subregions in remitted late-onset depression: a longitudinal resting-state study. *Neurosci Bull*. 2015;31(1):13-21. doi:10.1007/s12264-014-1489-1

28. van Mierlo TJ, Chung C, Foncke EM, Berendse HW, van den Heuvel OA. Depressive symptoms in Parkinson's disease are related to decreased hippocampus and amygdala volume. *Mov Disord*. 2015;30(2):245-252. doi:10.1002/mds.26112

29. Liao H, Cai S, Shen Q, et al. Networks Are Associated With Depression in Patients With Parkinson's Disease: A Resting-State Imaging Study. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. 2021;14. Accessed May 23, 2022. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2020.573538

30. Lin H, Cai X, Zhang D, Liu J, Na P, Li W. Functional connectivity markers of depression in advanced Parkinson's disease. *Neuroimage Clin*. 2019;25:102130. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2019.102130

31. Lim J, Bang Y, Choi HJ. Abnormal hippocampal neurogenesis in Parkinson's disease: relevance to a new therapeutic target for depression with Parkinson's disease. *Arch Pharm Res*. 2018;41(10):943-954. doi:10.1007/s12272-018-1063-x

32. Grieve SM, Korgaonkar MS, Koslow SH, Gordon E, Williams LM. Widespread reductions in gray matter volume in depression. *NeuroImage: Clinical*. 2013;3:332-339. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2013.08.016

33. Meng C, Brandl F, Tahmasian M, et al. Aberrant topology of striatum's connectivity is associated with the number of episodes in depression. *Brain*. 2014;137(2):598-609. doi:10.1093/brain/awt290

34. Furman DJ, Hamilton JP, Gotlib IH. Frontostriatal functional connectivity in major depressive disorder. *Biol Mood Anxiety Disord*. 2011;1:11. doi:10.1186/2045-5380-1-11

35. Kaiser RH, Andrews-Hanna JR, Wager TD, Pizzagalli DA. Large-scale network dysfunction in Major Depressive Disorder: Meta-analysis of resting-state functional connectivity. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2015;72(6):603-611. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.0071

36. McColgan P, Razi A, Gregory S, et al. Structural and functional brain network correlates of depressive symptoms in premanifest Huntington's disease. *Human Brain Mapping*. 2017;38(6):2819-2829. doi:10.1002/hbm.23527

37. Garcia-Gorro C, Llera A, Martinez-Horta S, et al. Specific patterns of brain alterations underlie distinct clinical profiles in Huntington's disease. *NeuroImage: Clinical*. 2019;23:101900. doi:10.1016/j.nicl.2019.101900

38. Friston KJ. Functional and Effective Connectivity: A Review. *Brain Connectivity*. 2011;1(1):13-36. doi:10.1089/brain.2011.0008

39. Friston KJ, Kahan J, Biswal B, Razi A. A DCM for resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage*. 2014;94:396-407. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.12.009

40. Tsvetanov KA, Henson RNA, Rowe JB. Separating vascular and neuronal effects of age on fMRI BOLD signals. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2021;376(1815):20190631. doi:10.1098/rstb.2019.0631

41. Zeidman P, Jafarian A, Corbin N, et al. A guide to group effective connectivity analysis, part 1: First level analysis with DCM for fMRI. *NeuroImage*. 2019;200:174-190. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.06.031

42. Chen JJ, Salat DH, Rosas HD. Complex Relationships between Cerebral Blood Flow and Brain Atrophy in Early Huntington's Disease. *Neuroimage*. 2012;59(2):1043-1051. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.08.112

43. Bastos-Leite AJ, Ridgway GR, Silveira C, Norton A, Reis S, Friston KJ. Dysconnectivity Within the Default Mode in First-Episode Schizophrenia: A Stochastic Dynamic Causal Modeling Study With Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*. 2015;41(1):144-153. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbu080

44. Friston KJ, Harrison L, Penny W. Dynamic causal modelling. *NeuroImage*. 2003;19(4):1273-1302. doi:10.1016/S1053-8119(03)00202-7

45. Friston KJ, Litvak V, Oswal A, et al. Bayesian model reduction and empirical Bayes for group (DCM) studies. *NeuroImage*. 2016;128:413-431. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.11.015

46. Klöppel S, Gregory S, Scheller E, et al. Compensation in Preclinical Huntington's Disease: Evidence From the Track-On HD Study. *EBioMedicine*. 2015;2(10):1420-1429. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2015.08.002

47. Tabrizi SJ, Langbehn DR, Leavitt BR, et al. Biological and clinical manifestations of Huntington's disease in the longitudinal TRACK-HD study: cross-sectional analysis of baseline data. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2009;8(9):791-801. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(09)70170-X

48. Beck AT, Steer RA, Brown GK, others. Manual for the Beck depression inventory-II. *San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation*. 1996;1(82):10-1037.

49. Snaith R, Constantopoulos A, Jardine M, McGuffin P. A clinical scale for the self-assessment of irritability. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*. 1978;132(2):164-171.

50. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta psychiatrica scandinavica*. 1983;67(6):361-370.

51. Mestre TA, van Duijn E, Davis AM, et al. Rating scales for behavioral symptoms in Huntington's disease: Critique and recommendations. *Movement Disorders*. 2016;31(10):1466-1478. doi:10.1002/mds.26675

52. De Souza J, Jones LA, Rickards H. Validation of self-report depression rating scales in Huntington's disease. *Movement Disorders*. 2010;25(1):91-96. doi:10.1002/mds.22837

53. Huntington Study Group (Kieburtz K, primary author). The Unified Huntington's Disease Rating Scale: Reliability and Consistency. *Movement Disorders*. 1996;11(2):136-142. doi:10.1002/mds.870110204

54. Warner JH, Long JD, Mills JA, et al. Standardizing the CAP Score in Huntington's Disease by Predicting Age-at-Onset. *Journal of Huntington's Disease*. 2022;11(2):153-171. doi:10.3233/JHD-210475

55. Langbehn DR, Hayden MR, Paulsen JS, and the PREDICT-HD Investigators of the Huntington Study Group. CAG-repeat length and the age of onset in Huntington disease (HD): a review and validation study of statistical approaches. *Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet*. 2010;153B(2):397-408. doi:10.1002/ajmg.b.30992

56. Penney JB, Vonsattel JP, MacDonald ME, Gusella JF, Myers RH. CAG repeat number governs the development rate of pathology in Huntington's disease. *Annals of Neurology*. 1997;41(5):689-692. doi:10.1002/ana.410410521

57. Zhang Y, Long JD, Mills JA, et al. Indexing disease progression at study entry with individuals at-risk for Huntington disease. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics*. 2011;156(7):751-763. doi:10.1002/ajmg.b.31232

58. Esteban O, Markiewicz CJ, Blair RW, et al. fMRIPrep: a robust preprocessing pipeline for functional MRI. *Nat Methods*. 2019;16(1):111-116. doi:10.1038/s41592-018-0235-4

59. Esteban O, Ciric R, Finc K, et al. Analysis of task-based functional MRI data preprocessed with fMRIPrep. *Nat Protoc*. 2020;15(7):2186-2202. doi:10.1038/s41596-020-0327-3

60. Esteban O, Birman D, Schaer M, Koyejo OO, Poldrack RA, Gorgolewski KJ. MRIQC: Advancing the automatic prediction of image quality in MRI from unseen sites. *PLOS ONE*. 2017;12(9):e0184661. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0184661

61. Reuter M, Schmansky NJ, Rosas HD, Fischl B. Within-subject template estimation for unbiased longitudinal image analysis. *Neuroimage*. 2012;61(4):1402-1418. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.02.084

62. Di X, Biswal BB. Identifying the default mode network structure using dynamic causal modeling on resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging. *NeuroImage*. 2014;86:53-59. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.07.071

63. Razi A, Kahan J, Rees G, Friston KJ. Construct validation of a DCM for resting state fMRI. *NeuroImage*. 2015;106:1-14. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.11.027

64. Yarkoni T, Poldrack RA, Nichols TE, Van Essen DC, Wager TD. Large-scale automated synthesis of human functional neuroimaging data. *Nat Methods*. 2011;8(8):665-670. doi:10.1038/nmeth.1635

65. Maldjian J, Laurienti P, Kraft R, Burdette J. An automated method for neuroanatomic and cytoarchitectonic atlas-based interrogation of fMRI data sets. *Neuroimage*. Published online July 25, 2003.

66. Altmann A, Ng B, Landau SM, Jagust WJ, Greicius MD. Regional brain hypometabolism is unrelated to regional amyloid plaque burden. *Brain*. 2015;138(12):3734-3746. doi:10.1093/brain/awv278

67. Novelli L, Friston K, Razi A. Spectral dynamic causal modeling: A didactic introduction and its relationship with functional connectivity. *Network Neuroscience*. Published online January 19, 2024:1-25. doi:10.1162/netn_a_00348

68. Sambataro F, Wolf ND, Pennuto M, Vasic N, Wolf RC. Revisiting default mode network function in major depression: evidence for disrupted subsystem connectivity. *Psychological Medicine*. 2014;44(10):2041-2051. doi:10.1017/S0033291713002596

69. Lemogne C, Delaveau P, Freton M, Guionnet S, Fossati P. Medial prefrontal cortex and the self in major depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders*. 2012;136(1):e1-e11. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2010.11.034

70. Drysdale AT, Grosenick L, Downar J, et al. Resting-state connectivity biomarkers define neurophysiological subtypes of depression. *Nat Med*. 2017;23(1):28-38. doi:10.1038/nm.4246

71. Sheline YI, Barch DM, Price JL, et al. The default mode network and self-referential processes in depression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2009;106(6):1942-1947. doi:10.1073/pnas.0812686106

72. Zhu X, Wang X, Xiao J, et al. Evidence of a Dissociation Pattern in Resting-State Default Mode Network Connectivity in First-Episode, Treatment-Naive Major Depression Patients. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2012;71(7):611-617. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2011.10.035

73. Greicius MD, Flores BH, Menon V, et al. Resting-State Functional Connectivity in Major Depression: Abnormally Increased Contributions from Subgenual Cingulate Cortex and Thalamus. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2007;62(5):429-437. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2006.09.020

74. De Souza J, Jones LA, Rickards H. Validation of self-report depression rating scales in Huntington's disease. *Mov Disord*. 2010;25(1):91-96. doi:10.1002/mds.22837

75. Bilal H, Warren N, Dahanayake P, Kelso W, Farrand S, Stout JC. The Lived Experiences of Depression in Huntington's Disease: A Qualitative Study. *Journal of Huntington's Disease*. 2022;11(3):321-335. doi:10.3233/JHD-220537

76. McAllister B, Gusella JF, Landwehrmeyer GB, et al. Timing and Impact of Psychiatric, Cognitive, and Motor Abnormalities in Huntington Disease. *Neurology*. 2021;96(19):e2395-e2406. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000011893

77. Berrios GE, Wagle AC, Marková IS, et al. Psychiatric symptoms and CAG repeats in neurologically asymptomatic Huntington's disease gene carriers. *Psychiatry Research*. 2001;102(3):217-225. doi:10.1016/S0165-1781(01)00257-8

78. Reedeker W, van der Mast RC, Giltay EJ, Kooistra TAD, Roos RAC, van Duijn E. Psychiatric Disorders in Huntington's Disease: A 2-Year Follow-up Study. *Psychosomatics*. 2012;53(3):220-229. doi:10.1016/j.psym.2011.12.010

79. Dale M, Maltby J, Shimozaki S, Cramp R, Rickards H. Disease stage, but not sex, predicts depression and psychological distress in Huntington's disease: A European population study. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. 2016;80:17-22. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2015.11.003

80. Reijmer YD, Schultz AP, Leemans A, et al. Decoupling of structural and functional brain connectivity in older adults with white matter hyperintensities. *Neuroimage*. 2015;117:222-229. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.05.054

81. McColgan P, Gregory S, Razi A, et al. White matter predicts functional connectivity in premanifest Huntington's disease. *Annals of Clinical and Translational Neurology*. 2017;4(2):106-118. doi:10.1002/acn3.384

82. Marder K, Zhao H, Myers RH, et al. Rate of functional decline in Huntington's disease. *Neurology*. 2000;54(2):452-452. doi:10.1212/WNL.54.2.452

83. Fiedorowicz JG, Mills JA, Ruggle A, Langbehn D, Paulsen JS, Group PHI of the HS. Suicidal Behavior in Prodromal Huntington Disease. *NDD*. 2011;8(6):483-490. doi:10.1159/000327754

84. Nehl C, Ready RE, Hamilton J, Paulsen JS. Effects of Depression on Working Memory in Presymptomatic Huntington's Disease. *JNP*. 2001;13(3):342-346. doi:10.1176/jnp.13.3.342

85. Smith MM, Mills JA, Epping EA, Westervelt HJ, Paulsen JS. Depressive Symptom Severity is Related to Poorer Cognitive Performance in Prodromal Huntington Disease. *Neuropsychology*. 2012;26(5):664-669. doi:10.1037/a0029218

86. Orchard ER, Ward PGD, Chopra S, Storey E, Egan GF, Jamadar SD. Neuroprotective Effects of Motherhood on Brain Function in Late Life: A Resting-State fMRI Study. *Cereb Cortex*. 2021;31(2):1270-1283. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhaa293

9.0 Figure legends

Figure 1 Effective Connectivity Changes Between Participants with a History of Depression and Those Without a History of Depression. Effective connections that reached the significance criterion are shown in the dorsal plane. Nodes in teal represent the bilateral caudate and putamen (striatum), while those in pink represent the medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, and bilateral hippocampi (default mode network). The weighted colours of the edges represent the estimated effect size and arrows show the directed influence of one region on another, including self-connections. Connections that reached the significance criterion are labelled. MPFC = Medial Prefrontal Cortex; PCC = Posterior Cingulate Cortex; HPC_L = Left Hippocampus; HPC_R = Right Hippocampus; CAU_L = Left Caudate; PU_L = Left Putamen; PU_R = Right Putamen.

Figure 2 DMN and Striatal Effective Connectivity Changes Associated With HADS-D Scores. Effective connections that reached the significance criterion are shown in the dorsal plane. (**A**) represents changes in effective connectivity for participants without a history of depression in association with HADS-D clinical cut-off scores. (**B**) represents changes in effective connectivity for participants with a history of depression in association with HADS-D clinical cut-off scores. Nodes in represent the bilateral caudate and putamen (striatum), while those in pink represent the medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, and bilateral hippocampi (default mode network). The weighted colours of the edges represent the estimated effect size and arrows show the directed influence of one region on another, including self-connections. Connections that reached the significance criterion are labelled. Figure generated using code from Orchard et al. 2021.[86] MPFC = Medial Prefrontal Cortex; PCC = Posterior

Cingulate Cortex; HPC_L = Left Hippocampus; HPC_R = Right Hippocampus; CAU_L = Left Caudate; PU_L = Left Putamen; PU_R = Right Putamen.

Figure 3 DMN and Striatal Effective Connectivity Changes Associated With BDI-II Scores. Effective connections that reached the significance criterion are shown in the dorsal plane. (**A**) represents changes in effective connectivity for participants without a history of depression in association with BDI-II clinical cut-off scores. (**B**) represents changes in effective connectivity for participants with a history of depression in association with BDI-II clinical cut-off scores. Nodes in represent the bilateral caudate and putamen (striatum), while those in pink represent the medial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate cortex, and bilateral hippocampi (default mode network). The weighted colours of the edges represent the estimated effect size and arrows show the directed influence of one region on another, including self-connections. Connections that reached the significance criterion are labelled. Figure generated using code from Orchard et al. 2021.[86] PCC = Posterior Cingulate Cortex; HPC_L = Left Hippocampus; HPC_R = Right Hippocampus; CAU_L = Left Caudate; PU_L = Left Putamen; PU_R = Right Putamen.


A
B
Network
Default Mode Network
weight
weight


A
B
Network
Default Mode Network
weight
weight

Table 1 Region of Interest (ROI) Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) Coordinates

		Super headings can be centred			
Region of Interest	**Network**	**X**	**Z**	**Y**	**Size of Sphere**
MPFC	Default Mode Network	3	54	-2	8 mm
PCC	Default Mode Network	0	-52	26	8 mm
Left Hippocampus	Default Mode Network	-29	-18	-16	6 mm
Right Hippocampus	Default Mode Network	29	-18	-16	6 mm
Left Caudate	Striatum	-10	14	0	6 mm
Right Caudate	Striatum	10	14	0	6 mm
Left Putamen	Striatum	-28	2	0	6 mm
Right Putamen	Striatum	28	2	0	6 mm

MPFC = Medial Prefrontal Cortex; PCC = Posterior Cingulate Cortex.

Table 2 Demographic, Clinical, and Psychiatric Characteristics of Participant Groups

Characteristic	History of Depression (*N*=38)	No History of Depression (*N*=55)	*p* value
Sex			0.314[a]
Female	22 (57.89%)	26 (47.27%)	
Male	16 (42.11%)	29 (52.73%)	
Age			0.642[b]
Mean (SD)	42.99 (7.10)	42.45 (10.92)	
Range	28.10 - 59.60	22.60 - 68.30	
Handedness			0.158[a]
Right-handed	31 (81.58%)	51 (92.73%)	
Left-handed	3 (7.89%)	3 (5.45%)	
Ambidextrous	4 (10.53%)	1 (1.82%)	
Ethnicity			0.418[a]
White	37 (97.37%)	53 (96.36%)	
American - Latin	1 (2.63%)	0 (0.00%)	
Asian - East	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.82%)	
Mixed	0 (0.00%)	1 (1.82%)	
Scanner Type			0.403[a]
Siemens	22 (57.89%)	27 (49.09%)	
Phillips	16 (42.11%)	28 (50.91%)	
HD-related Variables			
CAG Repeat Length			0.494[b]
Mean (SD)	42.58	43.24	
Standard Deviation	1.72	2.68	
Range	39.00 - 47.00	39.00 - 50.00	
CAP Score			0.587[b]
Mean (SD)	82.01 (9.98)	82.89 (11.20)	
Range	63.42 - 106.32	57.50 - 111.69	
DBS Score			0.537[b]
Mean (SD)	295.89 (53.28)	304.55 (53.17)	
Range	179.00 - 386.00	185.00 - 443.00	
UHDRS TMS Score			0.443[b]
Mean (SD)	5.89 (4.55)	5.09 (3.47)	
Standard Deviation	4.55	3.47	
Range	0.00 - 22.00	0.00 - 21.00	
Psychiatric Characteristics			
Current use of Mood Medication			**< 0.001**[a]
Yes	17 (44.74%)	5 (9.09%)	
BDI-II Score			**< 0.001**[b]
Mean (SD)	9.53 (8.47)	4.84 (7.20)	
Range	0.00 - 40.00	0.00 - 27.00	
BDI-II Cut-off (10/11)			0.078[a]
Significant Dep. Symptoms	13 (34.21%)	10 (18.18%)	
Low Dep. Symptoms	25 (65.79%)	45 (81.82%)	
HADS-D Score			**< 0.001**[b]
Mean (SD)	4.66 (4.58)	2.09 (3.24)	
Range	0.00 - 19.00	0.00 - 14.00	
HADS-D Cut-off (6/7)			0.283[a]
Significant Dep. Symptoms	8 (21.05%)	7 (12.73%)	
Low Dep. Symptoms	30 (78.95%)	48 (87.27%)	

Significant p values (≤ 0.05) are shown in bold. SD = standard deviation. CAG = cytosine-adenine-guanine. CAP = CAG-Age Product. DBS = Disease Burden Score. BDI-II = the Beck Depression Inventory, 2nd Edition. HADS-D = the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, Depression Subscale.
[a]Pearson's Chi-squared test
[b]Linear Model ANOVA


HPC_L
PU_L
PCC
MPFC
CAU_L
CAU_R
PU_R
HPC_R
positive
striatum
DMN
negative