Blunted anticipation but not consummation of food rewards in depression

Corinna Schulz[2,4], Johannes Klaus[2,3], Franziska Peglow[2], Sabine Ellinger[5], Anne Kühnel[1], Martin Walter[2,6,7,8], & Nils B. Kroemer[1-3*]

[1] Section of Medical Psychology, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Faculty of Medicine, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

[2] Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Tübingen Center for Mental Health, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

[3] German Center for Mental Health (DZPG), partner site Tübingen

[4] International Max Planck Research School for the Mechanisms of Mental Function and Dysfunction, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

[5] Institute of Nutritional and Food Sciences, Human Nutrition, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany

[6] Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Hospital Jena, Jena, Germany

[7] Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Otto-von-Guericke University Magdeburg, Magdeburg, Germany

[8] German Center for Mental Health (DZPG), partner site Halle-Jena-Magdeburg

Corresponding author*

Prof. Dr. Nils B. Kroemer, nkroemer@uni-bonn.de

Venusberg Campus 1, 53127 Bonn, Germany

Abstract

Anhedonia is a core symptom of major depressive disorder (MDD) and is associated with worse treatment outcomes. While its narrow definition as a hedonic or consummatory deficit evolved to encompass anticipatory and motivational reward facets, it remains unclear where reward deficits manifest. Since evidence that metabolic hormones influence reward processing accumulates, investigating their role in alleviating reward deficits may provide crucial insights. To address these gaps, we conducted a study with 103 participants, including 52 patients with MDD and 51 healthy control participants (HCPs). After overnight fasting, blood samples were collected to determine the concentration of ghrelin, glucose, insulin, and triglycerides in serum/plasma. Participants then completed a taste test with repeated ratings of wanting and liking for snacks before and after tasting, allowing to gradually move from reward anticipation to consummation. Patients with MDD showed decreased wanting (p = .046) but not liking for food rewards during visual anticipation. However, these group differences disappeared once patients inspected and tasted the food as patients increased wanting relative to HCPs (p = .004), providing strong evidence against the hypothesis of a consummatory deficit (Bayes Factors > 9). In contrast to a narrow definition of anhedonia, higher scores on the Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale (SHAPS) were more strongly associated with reduced anticipatory food wanting (p = .010), not liking, and more pronounced increases in wanting with reward proximity (p = .037). Across groups and phases, acyl ghrelin was associated with higher wanting and liking ratings, while poor glycemic control was associated with anhedonia. Overall, our study demonstrates that MDD and its cardinal symptom, anhedonia, are associated with a reduced anticipation of rewards rather than an impaired ability to experience pleasure. Since ghrelin was associated with elevated reward ratings, targeting the gut-brain axis could be a promising avenue for treating reward deficits.

Keywords: major depressive disorder, anhedonia, ghrelin, insulin resistance, taste test

Graphical Abstract



1. Introduction

As a core symptom of major depressive disorder (MDD), anhedonia is linked to worse treatment outcomes and reduced quality of life, presenting an unmet challenge for therapies (Uher et al., 2012; Whitton et al., 2023). Recently, the narrow definition of anhedonia as the "decreased subjective experience of pleasure" (Ribot, 1896) has evolved towards parsing anhedonia into different facets of reward processing, including anticipation and consummation (Husain & Roiser, 2018; Rømer Thomsen et al., 2015; Treadway & Zald, 2011). In translational research, reward is further dissociated into wanting (i.e., the motivational drive to pursue rewards dominating during anticipation) and liking (i.e., the hedonic pleasure derived from experiencing rewards dominating during consummation) (Berridge, 1996; Borsini et al., 2020). While ample evidence associates depression with deficits in reward processing, comprehensive investigations into anhedonia which distinguish when (anticipation vs consummation) and where (wanting vs liking) potential deficits manifest are scarce (Borsini et al., 2020; Halahakoon et al., 2020). Moreover, patients with MDD often experience opposing changes in appetite echoed in the reward circuit's functional architecture, suggesting the need to investigate reward deficits concerning symptoms rather than diagnosis (Kroemer et al., 2022). In addition to somatic symptoms in MDD, comorbid metabolic disorders (Andreoulakis et al., 2012; Kan et al., 2013) suggest a potential modulatory role of metabolic hormones on reward processing (Decarie-Spain & Kanoski, 2021; Kanoski & Boutelle, 2022; S. Liu & Borgland, 2015; Menzies et al., 2012). However, to harness the potential of metabolic hormones to alleviate reward deficits, a detailed mechanistic understanding of where reward alterations manifest is needed (Schulz et al., 2023).

Preclinical research has predominantly investigated anhedonia through consummatory reward responses (i.e., hedonic capacity), although the translation of taste-related tests to human research produced inconsistent results. Seminal research found that rats consumed lower amounts of sucrose and saccharose following chronic stress exposure, mimicking the appetite loss observed in (melancholic) depression (Katz, 1982). Since then, preclinical studies have primarily used sucrose intake or sucrose preference tests to assess anhedonia, in which a decreased preference for sucrose is interpreted as reduced liking (Markov, 2022; Scheggi et al., 2018; Verharen et al., 2023). However, conclusive evidence for lower pleasantness ratings of sweet solutions or deficits in gustatory or olfactory function in patients with MDD is lacking

(Amsterdam et al., 1987; Arrondo et al., 2015; Berlin et al., 1998; Dichter et al., 2010; Scinska et al., 2004; Swiecicki et al., 2009). Instead, emerging evidence suggests a role of motivation (Treadway et al., 2009), decreased coupling of liking and wanting (Huys et al., 2013), or reduced reward learning (Vrieze et al., 2013) in anhedonia. Indeed, a recent computational analysis of the sucrose preference test has identified the contribution of several of these reward facets (often uncontrolled), such as wanting to sucrose preference tests in addition to consummatory liking (Verharen et al., 2023), potentially underlying heterogeneous findings. Thus, there is a great demand to dissect reward behavior into subcomponents beyond consummatory liking, ultimately allowing targeted interventions to normalize aberrant reward-related behavior.

Metabolic hormones, such as ghrelin and insulin, play a significant role in reward processing, transcending their role in homeostatic food control (Geisler & Hayes, 2023; Narayanan et al., 2010). During fasting, more ghrelin is released, increasing food intake and incentive motivation (Dickson et al., 2011) via hypothalamic action and possibly vagal projections (So et al., 2023; Teckentrup & Kroemer, 2023). In support of this role, ghrelin has been linked to enhanced food cue reactivity (Kroemer et al., 2013; Malik et al., 2008), food odor conditioning (Han et al., 2018), alcohol self-administration and craving (Farokhnia et al., 2018; Koopmann et al., 2019), but not food palatability or consummatory reward responses (Overduin et al., 2012; Simon et al., 2017). Preclinical work further demonstrates that ghrelin amplifies dopamine signaling in the mesocorticolimbic circuit (Abizaid et al., 2006; Geisler & Hayes, 2023; Jerlhag, 2008; King et al., 2011; Quarta et al., 2009; Skibicka et al., 2011). Nevertheless, investigations into plasma ghrelin levels in depression have yielded inconsistent results (Barim et al., 2009; Kluge et al., 2009; Kurt et al., 2007; Matsuo et al., 2012; Ozsoy et al., 2014; Schanze et al., 2008). In part, such inconsistencies may stem from the heterogeneity of depressive symptoms (Fried et al., 2022). For instance, differences in metabolic dysregulation have been reported between melancholic and atypical depression (Lamers et al., 2013; Milaneschi et al., 2017), and an immune-metabolic subtype of depression for ‘atypical/energy-related symptoms’ has been suggested (de Kluiver et al., 2023; Milaneschi et al., 2020). In contrast to ghrelin, insulin increases postprandially, reduces food intake (Hallschmid et al., 2004; Schneider et al., 2022), and reduces dopamine signaling (Gruber et al., 2023; Kleinridders et al., 2015; Kullmann et al., 2021). Consequently, intranasal insulin application reduces food preferences, with lower insulin sensitivity attenuating this effect (Tiedemann et al.,

2017). Likewise, diminished insulin sensitivity not only weakens the translation of hunger into motivation for rewards (Hanssen, 2021) but also serves as an indicator of the efficacy of insulin, as evidenced by its association with the signal-to-noise ratio (i.e., an indicator of the signal effectiveness) of food reward signals in the nucleus accumbens (Kroemer et al., 2016). Consistent with a metabolic subtype, lower insulin sensitivity has been proposed to contribute to atypical depression (Fernandes et al., 2022; Simmons et al., 2020). While MDD frequently occurs with type 2 diabetes (Kullmann et al., 2016), it has also been linked to low insulin sensitivity in non-diabetic samples from cross-sectional studies (Lee et al., 2017; Shi et al., 2021), as well as to metabolic disturbances like elevated triglycerides and increased fasting glucose (Moradi et al., 2021). Taken together, metabolic hormones modulate reward processing, with ghrelin potentially enhancing incentive motivation during anticipation and insulin sensitivity reducing motivation during consummation.

To evaluate where reward deficits in depression manifest and to explore the modulatory potential of metabolic hormones in alleviating defined deficits, we integrate behavioral, clinical, and metabolic assessments. Specifically, we measured fasting hormone levels (serum/plasma) of participants with and without MDD, followed by repeated ratings of wanting and liking before and after tasting food snacks, gradually moving from food reward anticipation to consummation. Our hypotheses were threefold: First, we predicted that participants with MDD (vs. HCPs) would report lower ratings during anticipation and consummation. Second, we expected higher SHAPS scores, as a measure of the hedonic capacity, to be associated with reduced liking ratings during consummation relative to anticipation. Third, considering the potential roles of ghrelin in driving incentive motivation and insulin sensitivity in reducing food value signals, we expected heightened anticipatory wanting with higher levels of ghrelin and heightened consummatory wanting with lower insulin sensitivity. We find that depression and anhedonia are characterized by anticipatory but not consummatory deficits, while metabolic hormones are linked to specific symptoms and behavior, not depression itself. This challenges the persistent notion of anhedonia as a deficit in hedonic capacity and underscores the potential of investigating the gut-brain axis as a target to treat motivational deficits.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

The sample consisted of 103 participants (M_{Age} = 29.3 ± 7.3 years, M_{BMI} = 23.6 ± 3.3 kg/m^2; Table 1) from an ongoing study on the gut-brain axis in depression (https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT05318924; Fahed et al., 2023), including 52 participants with MDD, and 51 healthy control participants (HCP), who had never experienced a depressive episode. All individuals interested in participating were screened for eligibility by telephone. Individuals were included if they (1) were between 20 and 50 years old, (2) had a body mass index (BMI) between 18.5 kg/m² and 30 kg/m². They were excluded if they (1) ever met criteria for schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, severe substance dependence or neurological condition, or for HCP, mood or anxiety disorders, (2) met criteria for eating disorders, obsessive-compulsive disorder, trauma, and stressor-related disorder, or somatic symptom disorder within the last 12-months, (3) took medication (except anti-depressive medication for MDD), or suffered from illnesses that influenced body weight, (4) for female individuals if they were pregnant or nursing at the time. For the MDD group, individuals needed to fulfill DSM-5 criteria for MDD at screening. Individuals with comorbid anxiety disorders were also included due to the high comorbidity (Kaufman & Charney, 2000). To improve generalizability, we imposed no restrictions on medication type (e.g., psychotherapy, pharmacological, or apps) during the recruitment. However, to minimize confounding effects due to pharmacological changes, we required patients to be on stable medication for at least two months before study participation. Individuals were recruited using flyers and advertisements on social media (Facebook, Instagram) within the area surrounding Tübingen. Before inclusion, all individuals signed written informed consent. All procedures were approved by the local Ethics Committee of the University of Tübingen, Faculty of Medicine, in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (as revised in 2008). The compensation consisted of money and food rewards that could be acquired through the tasks (i.e., for full completion of the study, either €50 or 5 credit points + performance-based rewards). The study took place at the Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy in Tübingen.

Table 1

Participant characteristics

Characteristic	HCP (N=51)	MDD (N=52)	Overall (N=103)
Age [years]	30.5 ± 7.2	28.1 ± 7.4	29.3 ± 7.3
Body mass index [kg/m^2]	23.8 ± 3.0	23.5 ± 3.4	23.6 ± 3.3
Acyl ghrelin [pg/mol][1]	182 ± 205	166 ± 210	174 ± 207
Des-acyl ghrelin [pg/mol][1]	187 ± 94	190 ± 112	188 ± 104
Glucose [mg/dl]	82.7 ± 6.7	84.5 ± 8.5	83.6 ± 7.7
Insulin [mg/dl]	55.1 ± 28.2	69.0 ± 45.0	62.2 ± 38.1
HOMA-IR	1.65 ± 0.94	2.13 ± 1.49	1.89 ± 1.27
Triglycerides [mg/dl]	98.5. ± 63.58	106.6 ± 76.06	102.6 ± 69.93
TyG	4.42 ± 0.28	4.46 ± 0.29	4.44 ± 0.29
BDI	3.27 ± 4.14	27.58 ± 9.87	15.54 ± 14.36
SHAPS	6.63 ± 5.96	17.96 ± 6.12	12.35 ± 8.28
Anti-depressive medication			
None, *n*	51 (100%)	28 (53.8%)	79 (76.7%)
SSRI, *n*	0	11 (21.2%)	11 (10.7%)
Other, *n*	0	13 (25.0%)	13 (12.6%)

[1] Values of acyl and des-acyl ghrelin refer to data of 97 participants. Data of 5 HCPs and 1 MDD were missing.
Data are means ± SD if not indicated otherwise. *Abbreviations*: HCP = healthy control participants, MDD = major depressive disorder, HOMA-IR = homeostasis model assessment of insulin resistance, TyG = Triglyceride-glucose Index, BDI = Beck's Depression Inventory, SHAPS = Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale.

2.2. Procedure

2.2.1. Experimental procedure

Participants were invited to the laboratory for two parts: a clinical interview and a behavioral intake session. Due to the different durations of the clinical interview, HCPs usually completed both parts on one day, while participants with MDD completed them on separate days. During the first part, all participants completed the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-V (SCID-5-CV; First, 2015; ~1.5–2h for MDD, ~30 min for HCP). In addition, participants with MDD completed the Structured Interview Guide for

the Hamilton Rating Depression Scale with Atypical Depression Supplement (SIGH-ADS; Williams & Terman, 2003). The second part included fasting blood draws and a battery of reward-related tasks on the laptop (~3.5h). After a 12 h overnight fast – during which participants were instructed only to consume unsweetened beverages (e.g., water or coffee), participants answered state-related questions on a visual analog scale (VAS) repeatedly to indicate their current subjective metabolic (i.e., feelings of hunger, fullness, and satiety) and affective state. Blood samples for the determination of acyl and des-acyl ghrelin (EDTA plasma), glucose (fluoride EDTA plasma), insulin (serum), and triglycerides (lithium heparinized plasma) were taken upon arrival by using Monovettes (Sarstedt, Nümbrecht, Germany). Afterwards, information was recorded on the participant's last meal and drink, on anthropometric data (e.g., body weight and height), and, in the case of female participants, on the menstrual cycle phase (Fahed et al., 2023). Then, participants started with a battery of reward-related tasks. As part of this battery, they completed a food cue rating task (~15 min; Müller et al., 2022) and a taste test (~25 min). During the study session, individuals were provided with water ad libitum. The session concluded with participants receiving their financial compensation.

2.2.2. *Measures*

2.2.1. Hormone levels

Monovettes were transferred to the Central Laboratory of the Institute of Clinical Chemistry and Pathobiochemistry of the University Hospital Tübingen for analysis of glucose, insulin, and triglycerides in plasma or serum. Plasma samples for analysis of ghrelin were obtained from K3E-EDTA Monovettes immediately by centrifugation of the blood samples at 4°C with 2000 g for 10 min. Then, 500 µl of plasma was transferred into two cooled cryo tubes (Thermo Scientific™ Nunc™) each and 50 µl of cooled 1 M hydrochloric acid (HCl) in plasma to acid ratio of 10:1 was added to each tube to prevent ghrelin from deacetylating. The tubes were immediately capped, gently reversed, and cooled at -20°C before they were stored at -80°C (after 24 to 48 h). After completing the trial, the frozen samples were transferred on dry ice to the University of Bonn. The concentration of both acylated and unacetylated ghrelin was determined by using ELISA kits (#A05306 and #A05319; both from Bertin Bioreagent, Bertin

Technologies, Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France; distributed by BioCat, Germany) at the Institute of Nutritional and Food Sciences, Human Nutrition.

2.2.2. Food cue reactivity and taste test

To assess different facets of reward processing, we used a food cue reactivity (FCR) task (anticipation; Müller et al., 2022) and a taste test paradigm (anticipation and consummation; Fig.1a). Participants rated how much they liked and wanted 7 snacks during 5 phases (1st anticipation using a picture, 2nd anticipation seeing and smelling the actual snack, and three times after tasting the snacks during the consummation phase. The FCR task included the 7 snacks of the taste test among a set of 60 food and 20 non-food images (Charbonnier et al., 2016) being optimized for visual characteristics (homogenous plate with gray background). Participants were presented with each item for 2 seconds twice before they rated them using a joystick on an XBox controller and confirming by pressing the A button (Kroemer et al., 2018). The rating scale was presented for a maximum of 2.8 s. In separate trials, they rated how much they liked the item compared to all experienced sensations on a vertically labeled hedonic (visual analog) scale. Liking ratings ranged from −100 (strongest disliking imaginable) to +100 (strongest liking imaginable; (Lim et al., 2009). Wanting ratings were acquired using a horizontal scale and ranged from 0 (not wanted at all) to 100 (strongly wanted). The order of stimulus presentation and rating was pseudo-randomized.

The taste test included 7 snacks that were repeatedly rated during anticipation and consummation. The snacks were placed into separate glasses arranged in a circle on a wooden turntable. Water for rinsing between trials was provided. In addition, the corresponding pictures of the FCR set were shown on a laptop screen. Analogous to the FCR, participants then rated the items regarding food liking and wanting. They also rated the snack's intensity, sweetness, saltiness, and savoriness. As snacks were used pretzels (399 kcal/100g), NicNac's (555 kcal/100g; 527kcal/100g for the vegan alternative), and bread rings (460 kcal/100g) as salty snacks, rice crackers (380 kcal/100g) as neutral snack, and raisins (318 kcal/100g), chocolate chip cookies (502 kcal/100g; 491 kcal/100g for vegan alternative), and strawberry gummies (354 kcal/100g) as sweet snacks.

2.2.3. Questionnaires

Anhedonia. To measure symptoms of anhedonia, we used the German version of the Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale (SHAPS; Franz et al., 1998; Snaith et al., 1995), which is widely recognized as a measure of hedonic capacity. Participants indicated on 14 items how much they agreed or disagreed (Likert scale with 4 categories) with statements about experiencing pleasure over the last few days. The statements cover interests (e.g., “I would find pleasure in my hobbies and pastime”), social interactions (e.g., “I would enjoy seeing other people’s smiling face”), sensory experiences (e.g., “I would enjoy a warm bath or refreshing shower”), and food (e.g., "I would be able to enjoy my favorite meal"). We calculated an overall sum score ranging from 0 (minimum) to 42 points (maximum).

*Atypical Depression***.** To measure the extent of atypical depression, we calculated the atypical balance score from the SIGH-ADS (Williams & Terman, 2003). The atypical balance score weights the atypical items (weight gain, appetite increase, increased eating, carbohydrate craving or eating, hypersomnia, fatigability, mood or energy dips, and social withdrawal; SI1) against overall symptom presence, thus representing the percentage of atypicality, considering symptom severity, ranging from 0 (minimum) to 100% (maximum).

2.3. Data analysis

2.3.2. Preprocessing and mixed-effects modeling

As a measure of insulin resistance, we calculated the homeostasis model assessment of insulin resistance (HOMA-IR) using fasting glucose and insulin levels (Matthews et al., 1985; (insulin [pmol/l] /6,945) * glucose [mg/dl] / 405), as well as the triglyceride–glucose (TyG) index using fasting triglyceride and glucose levels (Unger et al., 2014; Ln(triglycerides [mg/dL] * glucose [mg/dL]) / 2). Since the distribution of hormone levels was skewed, data were log-transformed for parametric analyses (Kroemer et al., 2013; Kroemer et al., 2015). In addition, all hormone values were residualized for age, sex, and BMI to adjust for their influence on the observed hormone values (Makovey et al., 2007; Tramunt et al., 2020). For behavioral analyses, we applied linear models or linear mixed-effects models (i.e., when repeated measures were analyzed) using restricted maximum likelihood estimation. Specifically, we modeled the ratings (e.g., wanting, liking), using Group (dummy coded, 0: HCP, 1:

MDD), Snack type (sum coded), Phase (dummy coded, 0: cued anticipation), and nuisance regressors (centered BMI, age, and sex) as fixed effects. We included the interaction Group x Phase to test for group differences in relative changes between reward phases. We included random intercepts and slopes for snack type and phase to account for inter-individual variance in repeated ratings. Initially, we modeled phase as a dummy-coded factor (anticipation vs. consummation). However, upon inspection of the data and model output (Fig. S1a, Fig. 1B), we revised the model to capture Phase with 2 levels (dummy coded; 0: first anticipation, 1: second anticipation and consummation). This model outperformed the initial model (Fig. S1b-d). After investigating group differences (HCP vs. MDD), we stratified the MDD sample into participants with low atypical MDD (below median atypical balance score) versus high atypical MDD (above median atypical balance score), allowing to include the categorial *Atypical Group Factor* (HCP vs. low atypical balance vs. high atypical balance) to test across the whole sample. In addition to this categorical split, we tested the atypical balance score as a continuous measure by setting the scores of HCPs to zero and group-centering the scores before including the atypical balance score as a continuous predictor. For the models investigating anhedonia, we included the SHAPS score (centered), and for models investigating metabolic associations, we included the hormone values and their interaction with Group and Phase. To assess the potential impact of medication, we included medication type in the model by grouping the MDD sample: (1) no antidepressant medication, (2) selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), and (3) other antidepressant medication (Table 1; Fig. S1).

2.3.3. Statistical threshold and software

Primary analyses were conducted with R (v4.3.2; R Core Team 2021). For statistical modelling, we used the *lmer* and *summary* function of the '*lmerTest'* package v3.1.3 (Kuznetsova et al., 2017) which estimates degrees of freedom using the Satterthwaite approximation. For multivariate regression analysis, we used the *lm* and *anova* function, and visualized predictions using *ggPredict* of the *ggiraphExtra* package. All continuous predictors were grand-mean centered except for the atypical balance score, which was group-centered to include it as a continuous measure across the sample. We considered $\alpha < 0.05$ as significant. To evaluate the strength of evidence in wanting changes across phases between groups, we used Bayesian independent samples *t*-tests as implemented in JASP (JASP Team, 2024, v 0.18.3) using default effect size priors (Cauchy scale 0.707). Changes in wanting and their

correlation with SHAPS were analyzed using Bayesian correlation tests using a stretched beta prior with a width of 0.3, as large correlations have rarely been found in the psychological research (Funder & Ozer, 2019; Quintana & Williams, 2018).

3. Results

3.1. Lower wanting but not liking during initial anticipation in MDD

To disentangle reward facets of anhedonia, we developed a taste test in which participants with and without MDD repeatedly rated food liking and wanting before (anticipation) and during consumption (Fig. 1a). Using linear mixed-effect models, we modeled liking and wanting ratings to evaluate group differences throughout the taste test. Since individuals adjusted their ratings once the food was present in front of them (i.e., after an initial anticipatory rating, Fig. 1c), a model separating first anticipation (i.e., only images) from consummation (i.e., proximal inspection and sequential tasting) fit the data best (for model comparisons, see Fig. S2). During the first anticipation, participants with MDD reported similar food liking (b = 0.21, p = .95, Fig. 1b), but lower food wanting (b = -5.17, p = .046; Fig. 1c) compared to HCP. During the consummatory phase, participants with MDD reported similar liking (b = 2.87, p = .26) and no longer indicated lower food wanting (b = 1.56, p = .53). Consequently, participants with MDD increased wanting compared to HCPs, who decreased wanting (b_{Phase} = -5.74, p = .0009, $b_{MDDxPhase}$ = 6.73, p = .004; Fig. 1d). Notably, we did not observe any sex differences or dependencies on medication type. These results indicate differences in the incentive salience of distant, not proximal rewards, and there were no differences in pleasure when tasting food in MDD.

MDD is a heterogenous condition, and patients may experience increases or decreases in appetite and body weight during a depressive episode (Fig. S3). Melancholic depression is characterized by decreased appetite. Accordingly, patients with melancholic MDD primarily reported blunted food wanting during anticipation (vs. HCP: b = -8.97, p = .004, vs. atypical MDD: b = 7.77, p = .031, Fig. S3). In contrast, patients with atypical MDD did not initially show reduced food wanting (vs HCP: b = -1.20, p = .70, Fig. S3). Despite differences in initial ratings, all patients with MDD showed comparable increases in wanting during the consummatory phase, even though it was slightly more pronounced in atypical MDD ($b_{GroupxPhase}$ = 7.80, p = .008 vs melancholic MDD: $b_{GroupxPhase}$ = 5.73, p = .044, Fig. S3). Consequently, patients with atypical MDD even reported higher wanting during consummation compared to HCPs

(b = 6.60, p = .027). In contrast, we did not find differences in liking between melancholic (b = -2.04, p = .62) and atypical MDD (b = 2.54, p = .55) compared to HCPs, or between depression subtypes (b = 3.66, p = .31).



Figure 1: Patients with major depressive disorder (MDD) showed attenuated wanting but not liking during the anticipation of distant food rewards. A: To disentangle reward facets, participants with MDD and healthy control participants (HCP) repeatedly rated liking and wanting of snacks before (anticipation) and after consumption. B: No group differences in liking ratings (b = 0.21, p = .95), even after tasting food (b = 2.87, p = .26). C: Participants with MDD showed lower wanting ratings during anticipation (b = -5.17, p = .046). Once the food was proximal, wanting ratings aligned as patients with MDD reported increases in wanting compared to HCPs (b = 6.74, p = .004). D: Individuals with higher initial wanting ratings tended to decrease their ratings with proximal food, reminiscent of an optimism bias in HCPs. Conversely, individuals with lower initial wanting ratings tended to increase their ratings with proximal food, resembling an underestimation bias in MDD. Depicted are individual regression lines (left) and the correlation of unbiased (i.e., not including group) random intercepts and slopes derived from mixed-effects models, where differences in wanting ratings are predicted with phase and snack item (right). * p < .05, ** p < .01.

3.2. Anhedonia is associated with reduced anticipatory wanting for food rewards

After demonstrating associations of food ratings with depression subtypes, we investigated specific associations of ratings during anticipation and consummation with anhedonia (as measured by SHAPS scores). In contrast to the alleged reflection of impaired hedonic capacity (i.e., consummatory liking), higher SHAPS scores were associated with reduced wanting (b = -0.40, p = .010, Fig. 2c), but not liking (b = -0.36, p = .081, Fig. 2a). during the first anticipation rating. Furthermore, participants with higher SHAPS scores showed increases in wanting ratings for proximal rewards ($b_{SHAPSxPhase}$ = 0.30, p = .037, Fig. 2d). In contrast, liking ratings did not change ($b_{SHAPSxPhase}$ = 0.25, p = .080, Fig. 2b). Single items did not drive associations of anhedonia with reduced anticipatory wanting since we observed negative coefficients for all SHAPS items (Fig. 2e). Still, taste-related items (i.e., enjoying favorite food, enjoying a favorite drink) were among the three most robust predictors for reduced anticipatory wanting. For the interaction with phase, we observed positive associations (i.e., increased wanting with proximal rewards) for all SHAPS items. However, different items showed the strongest association compared to anticipation (Fig. 2e). Females (b = -3.80, p = .092) and older individuals (b = -.33, p = .047) tended to show overall lower wanting ratings, but this did not influence the associations with the SHAPS. Depression severity (using the BDI) did not explain lower initial wanting (b = .05, p = .60); however, severity was associated with the observed increases in wanting with proximal food ($b_{BDIxPhase}$ = .21, p = .018). As some items from the BDI tap into anhedonia (Pizzagalli et al., 2005), we also investigated the BDI anhedonia subscore, replicating the pattern for SHAPS for reduced initial wanting (b = -3.59, p = .046) and greater increases with proximal food ($b_{BDI_anhxPhase}$ = 2.74, p = .098), although the increases did not reach significance. Likewise, BDI anhedonia was not associated with liking (b = -2.66, p = .26) or changes in liking with consummation ($b_{BDI_anhxPhase}$ = 1.39, p = .39). Since lower wanting ratings were associated with SHAPS and melancholic MDD, we inspected the correlation between SHAPS and depression subtype (r = -.082, p = .56, Fig. S4), but these dimensions are largely orthogonal and may contribute independently to altered wanting ratings. Likewise, medication type did not alter the results. Notably, neither depression nor anhedonia was characterized by differences in perceived taste (SI2), further corroborating that depression and anhedonia are not associated with altered taste perception per se. As reported previously by our group, patients with MDD did

not differ from HCPs in subjective ratings of metabolic state (i.e., hunger, fullness (Fahed et al., 2023)).



Figure 2: Anhedonia was associated with blunted wanting of food rewards during anticipation but increased wanting with reward exposure. A: Higher SHAPS scores were weakly associated with lower liking during cued anticipation (b = -.36, p = .081). B: Higher SHAPS scores were not associated with increased food liking during the consummatory phase (b = .25, p = .080). C: Higher SHAPS scores were associated with lower wanting during cued anticipation (b = -.40, p = .010). D: Once food is proximal, higher SHAPS scores were associated with increases in wanting ratings after cued anticipation (b = .30, p = .037). For A-D, we depicted individual intercepts derived from an unbiased mixed-effects model (i.e., not including SHAPS), where differences in ratings were predicted by phase and snack items. E: All SHAPS items were negatively associated with anticipatory wanting, with imagining taking a bath, eating one's favorite food, or drinking one's favorite drink being the strongest predictors (left panel). Similarly, all SHAPS items were associated with increased wanting during the consummatory phase (right panel). * p < .05, ** p < .01.

3.3. Strong Bayesian evidence against a consummatory deficit in depression and anhedonia

To evaluate the strength of evidence against consummatory reward deficits in patients with MDD and anhedonia provided by our study, we calculated Bayes factors (BF) for the relative changes in ratings with consummation for patients vs. controls. The observed increases in wanting provide strong evidence against an alleged consummatory deficit in MDD (BF_{0+} = 16.27; i.e., 16x more likely to occur if we do not assume a deficit) and in association with anhedonia (BF_{0+} = 12.27; i.e., 12x more likely if we do not assume a deficit, i.e., no decrease with consummation; Fig. 3). Likewise, the absence of differences in liking changes provides moderate evidence against an alleged consummatory deficit in MDD (BF_{0+} = 9.09; i.e., 9x more likely to occur if we do not assume a deficit) and in association with anhedonia (BF_{0+} = 10.69; i.e., 11x more likely if we do not assume a deficit; Fig. 3). As wanting ratings changed in a direction opposite of expectation (i.e., increased rather than decreased with consummation), we additionally tested for an undirected effect. We found moderate (MDD) and anecdotal (SHAPS) evidence that ratings increase with consummation relative to anticipation in MDD and with higher SHAPS (Fig. S5). Prior selection did not qualitatively change these results (Robustness checks; Fig. S6-7). Within the MDD group, we found anecdotal evidence for differences between melancholic and atypical depression in lower wanting in melancholic MDD (BF_{01}= 2.33; i.e., 2x more likely to occur if we assume differences between subtypes) and stronger increases in wanting in atypical MDD (BF_{01}= 2.98; i.e., 3x more likely to occur if we assume differences between subtypes). This suggests that our findings reflect both differences between patients with MDD and HCPs as well as differences within patients with MDD in accordance with atypical symptoms (i.e., increases in appetite).



Figure 3: Bayesian hypothesis testing strengthens evidence against the common idea that depression or anhedonia is a consummatory deficit. Moderate to strong evidence against the common hypothesis that participants with MDD (vs HCPs) show relatively reduced liking (moderate) or wanting (strong) during consummation compared to anticipation (top panel; one-sided Bayesian independent samples *t*-test). Strong evidence against the hypothesis that higher SHAPS (i.e., lower "hedonic tone") is associated with stronger liking or wanting decreases during consummation (bottom panel; Bayesian Negative Correlation). *BF* = Bayes factor (with levels of evidence: 1-3 anecdotal, 3-10 moderate, 10-30 strong). A probability wheel on an area of size 1 represents the BF10, respectively.

3.4. Metabolic hormones are associated with symptoms, not MDD per se

Next, we evaluated the influence of metabolic hormones and potential disturbances on symptoms of MDD (Fig. 4). Although fasting acyl ghrelin levels (corrected for age, sex, and BMI) were numerically lower in MDD compared to HCP, this was not significant (b = -.27, p = .13, Fig. 4c; including depression severity: b = -.55, p = .094). However, patients with melancholic MDD showed lower ghrelin levels compared to HCPs (b = -.44, p = .039, Fig. S8). Likewise, ghrelin showed weak and non-significant associations with SHAPS scores (b = -1.63, p = .11, Fig. S9). Fasting

levels of des-acyl ghrelin were similar in patients with MDD and HCPs (b = .007, p = .94).

Regarding glycemic control, we observed no group differences in the TyG (b = .05, p = .33) and HOMA-IR (b = .19, p = .094) in patients with MDD compared to HCPs. This held when adding depression severity or depression subtype to the models, although BDI was positively associated with higher TyG (b = .01, p = .035). Still, patients with MDD showed higher fasting glucose levels (b = .03, p = .046). Similarly, participants with higher SHAPS scores showed higher fasting glucose (b = 32.54, p = .0007). In contrast to MDD, higher SHAPS scores were also associated with lower insulin sensitivity (b = 4.19, p = .005, Fig. 4b) and higher TyG (b = 6.20, p = .040) across groups. The association of anhedonia with HOMA-IR (b = 2.53, p = .023) and glucose (b = 20.80, p = .004) exceeded the effects of MDD since including Group in the model did not fully attenuate the associations. In contrast, the association with the triglyceride index was attenuated (b = 4.21, p = .058, Fig. 4b). Likewise, depression severity or depression subtype did not qualitatively alter these associations, except for TyG, which was no longer significantly associated with SHAPS after including depression severity (b = 2.30, p = .27), indicative that glucose levels and insulin dominate the association between anhedonia and glycemic control. Notably, the association between HOMA-IR and SHAPS was attenuated in melancholic MDD (b = -7.11, p = .008, Fig. S10). We did not observe any sex differences. These results support a link between poor glycemic control and anhedonia in depression.



Figure 4: Metabolic disturbances were associated with specific symptom profiles of depression. A: Metabolic parameters were determined after a 12h overnight fast, including acyl and des-acyl ghrelin, insulin, glucose, and triglycerides. The latter three were used to determine two indices of insulin resistance, the HOMA-IR and triglyceride index (TyG). B: Higher insulin resistance (controlled for BMI, sex, and age) as indexed by HOMA-IR (b = 4.19, p = .005) and TyG (b = 6.20, p = .040) was associated with SHAPS. Glucose levels were strongly associated with SHAPS (b = 32.54, p = .0007). C: Cumming estimation plots show no significant group differences in metabolic hormones, except glucose levels which were higher in MDD (b = .03, p = .046). Effect size and bootstrapped 95% CIs were plotted in addition to raw data. *Note*: All hormonal values were log-transformed and residualized for sex, age, and BMI.

3.5. Acyl ghrelin is associated with overall higher ratings of food reward

Next, we assessed whether metabolic hormones and potential disturbances translate to differential ratings collected during the taste test. Using linear mixed-effects models, we found a main effect for ghrelin for wanting ($b_{Ghrelin}$ = 3.30, p = .015; Phase centered) and liking ($b_{Ghrelin}$ = 3.50, p = .041; Phase centered) and no interactions with phase, suggesting that acyl ghrelin is associated with higher ratings of food rewards across phases (Fig. 5A, Phase dummy coded). To corroborate this result, we tested

for a multivariate effect of acyl ghrelin on liking and wanting ratings across phases (accounting for group). Accordingly, acyl ghrelin was associated with higher ratings overall (Pillai's Trace $V = .07$, $F(2, 90) = 3.16$, $p = .047$). Separate univariate ANOVAs showed associations for wanting ($b_{wanting} = 3.72$, $p = .015$) and liking ($b_{liking} = 3.45$, $p = .039$), supporting a role of ghrelin in incentive motivation. Adding depression severity to the model did not alter these associations (Pillai's Trace $V = .07$, $F(2, 89) = 3.47$, $p = .035$). As reported previously by our group, ghrelin was not associated with subjective ratings of metabolic state (Fahed et al., 2023) and adding subjective state ratings to the models did not qualitatively alter the results. Notably, higher levels of acyl ghrelin reduced the correspondence between wanting and liking ratings ($b_{likingxGhrelin} = -.23$, $p = .005$), pointing to a potential shift in the integration of incentive salience and hedonics, such that with higher acyl ghrelin levels less liked food rewards are wanted more (Fig. 5b). This interaction did not change when adding group and depression severity to the model. Females ($b = -4.02$, $p = .028$) and older individuals ($b = -.33$, $p = .009$) showed overall reduced wanting. In contrast, fasting levels of des-acyl ghrelin showed weaker and non-significant associations with wanting and liking, and we did not observe associations between the TyG and HOMA-IR with wanting or liking (Fig. S11).



Figure 5: Acyl ghrelin modulated the coupling between liking and wanting of food rewards. A: Estimated marginal means plot of fitted linear mixed-effects models to predict liking (bottom) and wanting (top), using acyl ghrelin as a fixed effect and its interaction with phase. Higher levels of acyl ghrelin were associated with higher ratings of food wanting during consummation and higher ratings of liking during anticipation. Additional multivariate regression showed that the association of ghrelin and ratings was not specific to liking or wanting (Pillai's Trace V = .07, $F(2, 90) = 3.16$, $p = .047$). B: Estimated marginal means of a fitted linear model to predict average wanting (across phases and snacks), using acyl ghrelin as a fixed effect and its interaction with liking ratings. Ratings of liking and wanting were strongly positively associated, but acyl ghrelin modulated this coupling. With higher fasting ghrelin levels, food wanting became less dependent on liking ($b = .23$, $p = .005$).

4. Discussion

An improved distinction between failing to seek pleasurable activities and not enjoying them holds actionable implications for treating anhedonia as a cardinal symptom of MDD (Husain & Roiser, 2018; Treadway & Zald, 2011). Here, we combined comprehensive clinical, behavioral, and metabolic assessments to localize reward dysfunction in MDD and gauge the potential for interventions targeting the gut-brain axis (Decarie-Spain & Kanoski, 2021; Geisler & Hayes, 2023; Schulz et al., 2023; Stouffer et al., 2015). First, we show that patients with MDD and anhedonia primarily experience reduced anticipatory wanting for food rewards. In contrast to the

conventional notion that anhedonia is an inability to experience pleasure, we found no differences in anticipatory or consummatory liking and even relative increases in wanting during consummation. Second, our unique design shows that reward deficits are marked for distal (i.e., first anticipation) but not proximal (i.e., second anticipation and consummation) rewards, contributing to an improved mechanistic understanding of anhedonia as a motivational deficit. Third, we show that peripheral levels of metabolic hormones are associated with specific aspects of reward function rather than MDD *per se*. Lower insulin sensitivity and higher glucose levels were associated with anhedonia, whereas higher fasting acyl ghrelin levels were associated with higher wanting and liking ratings. Since ghrelin levels were lower in melancholic MDD, it is plausible that altered gut-brain signaling may contribute to motivational symptoms in melancholic MDD experiencing loss of appetite and weight. Our results corroborate the role of reward anticipation in anhedonia and highlight reward proximity and metabolic health as factors for future translational work. Crucially, increases in wanting in patients with MDD and anhedonia during reward consummation provide strong evidence against the hypothesized deficit in hedonic capacity and call for a revision of the term “anhedonia”.

Our findings extend previous work on impaired reward processing in depression by disentangling two crucial phases often investigated separately before (Halahakoon et al., 2020): anticipation and consummation. Blunted wanting ratings during anticipation might reflect lower incentive motivation in MDD, reducing the tendency to approach a reward ('wanting', Berridge et al., 2009) despite comparable ratings of pleasantness and taste quality. Subjective ratings of wanting have been linked to the recruitment of core regions within the reward circuit (Jiang et al., 2015; Radoman et al., 2021) and dopamine neurotransmission for food cues during anticipation (Smith et al., 2016; Volkow et al., 2002), indicative of incentive motivation to pursue rewards. In depression, blunted recruitment of the reward circuitry during anticipation of incentive cues has been reported (Hägele et al., 2015; Keren et al., 2018; Takamura et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2021; but Schwarz et al., 2020); supporting that the desire for rewards might be altered in MDD. This mechanism may contribute to symptoms of melancholic MDD, which has been associated with the failure to develop a biased response for more frequently rewarded stimuli (Fletcher et al., 2015) and deficits in reward anticipation during a slot machine task (Liu et al., 2016). Accordingly, within the MDD group, we found reduced wanting in the melancholic subtype. Crucially, anhedonia was

more strongly associated with blunted wanting (vs. liking) ratings during anticipation followed by larger increases in wanting during consummation, thereby contradicting the conventional notion that anhedonia reflects an inability to experience pleasure (Nguyen et al., 2021; Treadway & Zald, 2011). As anhedonia questionnaires inherently assess the recollected experience of distant rewards, they reflect subjective representations of motivational value or negativity bias (Kieslich et al., 2022). Consequently, they align more closely with processes involved in cued anticipation rather than direct hedonic experiences. In support of this notion, our results argue against using questionnaires, such as the SHAPS, as measures of hedonic capacity (Der-Avakian & Markou, 2012). Instead, our presented results suggest that behavioural assessments provide more nuanced insights into reward deficits that may better guide future translational work than questionnaires alone.

One strength of our study design is that it resolves intra-individual changes across phases, pinpointing lower food anticipatory wanting in patients with MDD and anhedonia. In principle, two processes may explain the group differences in anticipation but not consummation: (1) overestimation of reward value during anticipation in HCP (Sharot, 2011), or (2) underestimation of reward value during anticipation in MDD (Korn et al., 2014). Our findings support both processes: while wanting decreased in HCPs during consummation, it increased in patients with MDD. Crucially, larger corrections of an initial negative bias were associated with anhedonia, substantiating that anhedonia is primarily related to altered motivational reward anticipation (Treadway et al., 2009). Our findings also argue against a mechanistic deficit in reward learning that drives anhedonia (Vrieze et al., 2013) as the differences in wanting ratings faded already in the mere presence of the rewards. Since beliefs about the distance to a reward or desirable state may dictate wanting and instrumental motivation (Huys & Browning, 2022), participants may differ in their reward-related expectations, irrespective of momentary enjoyment during consummation. For instance, internal beliefs that increase the perceived distance of a reward might reduce hedonic experiences (Hall et al., 2024). Accordingly, negative biases in patients with MDD concerning rewards have been reported before with diverse paradigms (Cooper et al., 2021; Korn et al., 2014; Kube, 2023). Taken together, blunted reward anticipation might be explained by perceived reward distance more than by a failure to experience or learn from rewards. Increased reward proximity is targeted by behavioral activation therapy, which augments the exposure to rewards. However, behavioral activation

therapy has led to heterogenous results, possibly because it does not address the negative bias during anticipation effectively, and instead capitalizes on reward responsiveness (Alsayednasser et al., 2022; Webb et al., 2023). Therefore, additional refinements are necessary to treat anhedonia more effectively.

By combining precision-oriented clinical and behavioral assessments with metabolic profiling, our study illustrates the potential of metabolic hormones to modulate reward responses (S. Liu & Borgland, 2015; Menzies et al., 2012; Schulz et al., 2023). In line with the comorbidity between MDD and type 2 diabetes (Kullmann et al., 2016), lower insulin sensitivity and higher fasting glucose levels were strongly associated with anhedonia. Likewise, hyperglycemia, diet-induced changes in insulin signaling, and knockout of insulin receptors facilitate depression and anhedonia-like behavior in rodents (Aswar et al., 2017; Dutheil et al., 2016; Horman et al., 2021; Kleinridders et al., 2015). However, we did not observe altered metabolic hormone concentrations in MDD compared to HCPs when adjusted for age, sex, and BMI; only higher glucose levels were found in MDD, supporting that primarily the anhedonic subtype of MDD is associated with metabolic dysregulation (Moreira et al., 2019; Willame et al., 2022). Although neither insulin sensitivity nor glucose levels affected food ratings, it is plausible that the effect is smaller if food is only tasted and not consumed ad libitum. In contrast to glucose, fasting levels of acyl ghrelin were not different in depression; however, taking depression subtypes into account revealed lower levels of acyl ghrelin in melancholic MDD. At the same time, higher ghrelin was associated with higher wanting and liking ratings across reward phases. This is in accordance with (preclinical) studies showing that ghrelin increases food cue reactivity (Kroemer et al., 2013; Malik et al., 2008), food intake (Cornejo et al., 2021), greater motivation to work for food (Skibicka et al., 2011), and is involved in augmenting various drug rewards (D'Cunha et al., 2020; Dunn et al., 2019; Farokhnia et al., 2018), mainly via increased dopamine transmission in the mesocorticolimbic pathway (Dunn et al., 2019; Engel et al., 2023). The association of ghrelin and subjective ratings of wanting and liking across phases of the taste test supports the role of ghrelin in increasing the 'appetizer effect' (Yeomans, 1996), as fasting levels of ghrelin have been associated with increases in subjective appetite during the initial stages of meals (Kroemer et al., 2013). Furthermore, ghrelin might modulate dopamine transmission and alter reward expectancy signals during cued rewards (Ott et al., 2023). With higher ghrelin levels, wanting ratings were less coupled with liking, indicating that during an

energy deficit, the motivation for food rewards increases more independently of the hedonic impact (Rogers et al., 2021). Given the conflicting evidence on ghrelin's action in depression (Simmons et al., 2020), we found lower ghrelin levels in melancholic MDD but not in depression overall. A stronger contribution of ghrelin to heightened reward function might be of high clinical relevance for melancholic MDD because this group showed the anticipatory deficit in food wanting. Melancholic MDD is associated with HPA hyperactivity (Lamers et al., 2013), and preclinical studies have shown that ghrelin regulates stress-induced anxious behavior via the HPA axis (Spencer, 2012), supporting a link between homeostatic signals and affective states (Fahed et al., 2023). Such mechanisms may contribute to the anti-depressive effects of fasting interventions (Berthelot et al., 2021; Murta et al., 2023). Taken together, capitalizing on metabolic signals might provide better treatments for motivational deficits in depression (Ferstl et al., 2022, 2023).

5. Limitations

Despite notable strengths, several study limitations should be addressed in future work. First, parsing reward behavior into different facets revealed differences between cued anticipation and consummation, but the strong effect of reward proximity on group differences was unexpected. Future research may systematically vary additional components such as proximity and probability or certainty of the reward outcome (Hong et al., 2024; Padrão et al., 2013; Treadway et al., 2009). Second, we assessed inter-individual differences in fasting levels of hormones and meal-related changes in hormone levels after the consummatory phase could reveal additional contributions to the regulation of reward function. Relatedly, the absence of differences in peripheral hormone levels does not preclude differences in central levels or central sensitivity (Fernandes et al., 2022; Lockie et al., 2015). Interventional studies administering insulin or ghrelin will help substantiate the link between metabolism and reward processing in MDD. Third, given the heterogeneity of MDD symptom profiles (Fried et al., 2022), our use of an atypical balance score captured well-documented differences among patients. Still, the atypical balance score does not consider the DSM-5 mood reactivity criteria for atypical depression, and heterogeneity of the construct is hindering evidence synthesis (Lorenzo-Luaces et al., 2021). Thus, future research could use symptom networks instead (Fried et al., 2020), which require much larger samples though.

6. Conclusion

Anhedonia is a core symptom of depression, yet it may conflate discernable facets of reward function, calling for distinct mechanistic therapies. Here, we disentangled anticipatory and consummatory phases of reward processing to show that depression and anhedonia are characterized by blunted reward anticipation rather than an inability to derive pleasure from rewards. Crucially, we found that wanting already improves with the proximity of the food reward, pointing to a motivational deficit that is corrected by larger consummatory increases compared to healthy individuals. In line with the motivational role of ghrelin, our results highlight that altered gut-brain signaling may contribute to blunted reward function across phases which may contribute to the symptoms of melancholic MDD. To conclude, precision-oriented behavioral assessments may pave the way towards optimized treatments of reward deficits to improve the quality of life of patients with anhedonia. Based on our findings, encouraging patients with MDD to deliberately experience rewards by removing potential motivational roadblocks may provide a surprisingly straightforward improvement that can be incorporated into cognitive-behavioral treatment modules.

Data availability statement

All data for the analysis and the code to generate plots is available upon request.

Acknowledgement

We thank Nora Gerth, Ebru Sarmisak, Yul Wegner, Anne Schiller, Antonia Schlaich, Johanna Voß, and Rauda Fahed for help with data acquisition. We also thank Hannah Groß for general support and early visualizations of the task design. Stephanie Ebbinghaus kindly helped with running the ELISA tests. The study was supported by DFG KR 4555/7-1, KR 4555/9-1, KR 4555/10-1, and & WA 2673/15-1.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Corinna Schulz: Formal Analysis, Visualization, Project administration, Investigation, Writing- Original draft preparation**,** Reviewing and Editing. **Johannes Klaus**: Project administration, Investigation. **Franziska Peglow**: Investigation. **Anne Kühnel**: Writing- Reviewing and Editing. **Sabine Ellinger***:* Investigation, Writing- Reviewing and Editing. **Martin Walter**: Conceptualization, Methodology, Funding acquisition. **Nils B. Kroemer**: Conceptualization, Methodology, Funding acquisition,

Supervision, Project administration, Resources, Validation, Writing- Reviewing and Editing.

Financial Disclosure

JK works as a study therapist in a multicenter phase IIb study by Beckley Psychtech Ltd on 5-MeO-DMT in patients with MDD, unrelated to this investigation. JK did not receive any financial compensation from the company. MW is a member of the following advisory boards and gave presentations to the following companies: Bayer AG, Germany; Boehringer Ingelheim, Germany; Novartis, Perception Neuroscience, HMNC and Biologische Heilmittel Heel GmbH, Germany. MW has further conducted studies with institutional research support from HEEL and Janssen Pharmaceutical Research for a clinical trial (IIT) on ketamine in patients with MDD, unrelated to this investigation. MW did not receive any financial compensation from the companies mentioned above. All other authors report no biomedical financial interests or other potential conflicts of interest.

References

Abizaid, A., Liu, Z.-W., Andrews, Z. B., Shanabrough, M., Borok, E., Elsworth, J. D., Roth, R. H., Sleeman, M. W., Picciotto, M. R., Tschöp, M. H., Gao, X.-B., & Horvath, T. L. (2006). Ghrelin modulates the activity and synaptic input organization of midbrain dopamine neurons while promoting appetite. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, *116*(12), 3229–3239. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI29867

Alsayednasser, B., Widnall, E., O'Mahen, H., Wright, K., Warren, F., Ladwa, A., Khazanov, G. K., Byford, S., Kuyken, W., Watkins, E., Ekers, D., Reed, N., Fletcher, E., McMillan, D., Farrand, P., Richards, D., & Dunn, B. D. (2022). How well do Cognitive Behavioural Therapy and Behavioural Activation for depression repair anhedonia? A secondary analysis of the COBRA randomized controlled trial. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *159*, 104185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2022.104185

Amsterdam, J. D., Settle, R. G., Doty, R. L., Abelman, E., & Winokur, A. (1987). Taste and smell perception in depression. *Biological Psychiatry*, *22*, 1481–1485. https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3223(87)90108-9

Andreoulakis, E., Hyphantis, T., Kandylis, D., & Iacovides, A. (2012). Depression in diabetes mellitus: A comprehensive review. *Hippokratia*, *16*(3), 205–214.

Arrondo, G., Murray, G. K., Hill, E., Szalma, B., Yathiraj, K., Denman, C., & Dudas, R. B. (2015). Hedonic and disgust taste perception in borderline personality disorder and depression. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *207*(1), 79–80. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.114.150433

Aswar, U., Chepurwar, S., Shintre, S., & Aswar, M. (2017). Telmisartan attenuates diabetes induced depression in rats. *Pharmacological Reports*, *69*(2), 358–364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pharep.2016.12.004

Barim, A. O., Aydin, S., Colak, R., Dag, E., Deniz, O., & Sahin, I. (2009). Ghrelin, paraoxonase and arylesterase levels in depressive patients before and after citalopram treatment. *Clinical Biochemistry*, *42*(10–11), 1076–1081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinbiochem.2009.02.020

Berlin, I., Givry-Steiner, L., Lecrubier, Y., & Puech, A. J. (1998). Measures of anhedonia and hedonic responses to sucrose in depressive and schizophrenic patients in comparison with healthy subjects. *European Psychiatry*, *13*(6), 303–309. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(98)80048-5

Berridge, K. C. (1996). Food reward: Brain substrates of wanting and liking. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *20*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7634(95)00033-B

Berridge, K. C., Robinson, T. E., & Aldridge, J. W. (2009). Dissecting components of reward: 'Liking', 'wanting', and learning. *Current Opinion in Pharmacology*, *9*(1), 65–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coph.2008.12.014

Berthelot, E., Etchecopar-Etchart, D., Thellier, D., Lancon, C., Boyer, L., & Fond, G. (2021). Fasting Interventions for Stress, Anxiety and Depressive Symptoms: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Nutrients*, *13*(11). https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13113947

Borsini, A., Wallis, A. S. J., Zunszain, P., Pariante, C. M., & Kempton, M. J. (2020). Characterizing anhedonia: A systematic review of neuroimaging across the subtypes of reward processing deficits in depression. In *Cognitive, Affective and Behavioral Neuroscience* (Vol. 20, Issue 4, pp. 816–841). Springer. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-020-00804-6

Cooper, J. A., Nuutinen, M. R., Lawlor, V. M., DeVries, B. A. M., Barrick, E. M., Hossein, S., Cole, D. J., Leonard, C. V., Hahn, E. C., Teer, A. P., Shields, G.

S., Slavich, G. M., Ongur, D., Jensen, J. E., Du, F., Pizzagalli, D. A., & Treadway, M. T. (2021). Reduced adaptation of glutamatergic stress response is associated with pessimistic expectations in depression. *Nature Communications*, *12*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23284-9

Cornejo, M. P., Denis, R. G. P., García Romero, G., Fernández, G., Reynaldo, M., Luquet, S., & Perello, M. (2021). Ghrelin treatment induces rapid and delayed increments of food intake: A heuristic model to explain ghrelin's orexigenic effects. *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences*, *78*(19), 6689–6708. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00018-021-03937-0

D'Cunha, T. M., Chisholm, A., Hryhorczuk, C., Fulton, S., & Shalev, U. (2020). A role for leptin and ghrelin in the augmentation of heroin seeking induced by chronic food restriction. *Psychopharmacology*, *237*(3), 787–800. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-019-05415-9

de Kluiver, H., Jansen, R., Penninx, B. W. J. H., Giltay, E. J., Schoevers, R. A., & Milaneschi, Y. (2023). Metabolomics signatures of depression: The role of symptom profiles. *Translational Psychiatry*, *13*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41398-023-02484-5

Decarie-Spain, L., & Kanoski, S. E. (2021). Ghrelin and Glucagon-Like Peptide-1: A Gut-Brain Axis Battle for Food Reward. *Nutrients*, *13*(3), 977. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu13030977

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

Dichter, G. S., Smoski, M. J., Kampov-Polevoy, A. B., Gallop, R., & Garbutt, J. C. (2010). Unipolar depression does not moderate responses to the Sweet Taste Test. *Depression and Anxiety*, *27*(9), 859–863. https://doi.org/10.1002/da.20690

Dickson, S. L., Egecioglu, E., Landgren, S., Skibicka, K. P., Engel, J. A., & Jerlhag, E. (2011). The role of the central ghrelin system in reward from food and chemical drugs. *Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology*, *340*(1), 80–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mce.2011.02.017

Dunn, D. P., Bastacky, J. M. R., Gray, C. C., Abtahi, S., & Currie, P. J. (2019). Role of mesolimbic ghrelin in the acquisition of cocaine reward. *Neuroscience Letters*, *709*, 134367. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2019.134367

Dutheil, S., Ota, K. T., Wohleb, E. S., Rasmussen, K., & Duman, R. S. (2016). High-Fat Diet Induced Anxiety and Anhedonia: Impact on Brain Homeostasis and Inflammation. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *41*(7), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2015.357

Engel, J. A., Pålsson, E., Vallöf, D., & Jerlhag, E. (2023). Ghrelin activates the mesolimbic dopamine system via nitric oxide associated mechanisms in the ventral tegmental area. *Nitric Oxide*, *131*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.niox.2022.12.001

Fahed, R., Schulz, C., Klaus, J., Ellinger, S., Walter, M., & Kroemer, N. B. (2023). Ghrelin is associated with an elevated mood after an overnight fast in depression. *medRxiv*, 2023.12.18.23300133. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.18.23300133

Farokhnia, M., Grodin, E., Lee, M., Oot, E., Blackburn, A., Stangl, B., Schwandt, M., Farinelli, L., Momenan, R., Ramchandani, V., & Leggio, L. (2018). Exogenous ghrelin administration increases alcohol self-administration and modulates brain functional activity in heavy-drinking alcohol-dependent individuals.

MOLECULAR PSYCHIATRY, *23*(10), 2029–2038. https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2017.226

Fernandes, B. S., Salagre, E., Enduru, N., Grande, I., Vieta, E., & Zhao, Z. (2022). Insulin resistance in depression: A large meta-analysis of metabolic parameters and variation. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *139*, 104758. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104758

Ferstl, M., Kühnel, A., Klaus, J., Lin, W. M., & Kroemer, N. B. (2023). *Non-invasive vagus nerve stimulation conditions increased invigoration and wanting in depression* (p. 2023.09.28.23296284). medRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.28.23296284

Ferstl, M., Teckentrup, V., Lin, W. M., Kräutlein, F., Kühnel, A., Klaus, J., Walter, M., & Kroemer, N. B. (2022). Non-invasive vagus nerve stimulation boosts mood recovery after effort exertion. *Psychological Medicine*, *52*(14), 3029–3039. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720005073

First, M. B. (2015). Structured Clinical Interview for the DSM (SCID). In *The Encyclopedia of Clinical Psychology* (pp. 1–6). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118625392.wbecp351

Fletcher, K., Parker, G., Paterson, A., Fava, M., Iosifescu, D., & Pizzagalli, D. A. (2015). Anhedonia in melancholic and non-melancholic depressive disorders. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *184*, 81–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2015.05.028

Franz, M., Lemke, M., Meyer, T., Ulferts, J., Puhl, P., & Snaith, R. (1998). Deutsche Version der Snaith-Hamilton-Pleasure-Scale (SHAPS-D). *Fortschritte der Neurologie · Psychiatrie*, *66*(09), 407–413. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-2007-995279

Fried, E. I., Flake, J. K., & Robinaugh, D. J. (2022). Revisiting the theoretical and methodological foundations of depression measurement. *Nature Reviews Psychology 2022*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-022-00050-2

Fried, E. I., von Stockert, S., Haslbeck, J. M. B., Lamers, F., Schoevers, R. A., & Penninx, B. W. J. H. (2020). Using network analysis to examine links between individual depressive symptoms, inflammatory markers, and covariates. *Psychological Medicine*, *50*(16), 2682–2690. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291719002770

Funder, D. C., & Ozer, D. J. (2019). Evaluating Effect Size in Psychological Research: Sense and Nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *2*(2), 156–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245919847202

Geisler, C. E., & Hayes, M. R. (2023). Metabolic hormone action in the VTA: Reward-directed behavior and mechanistic insights. *Physiology & Behavior*, *268*, 114236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2023.114236

Gruber, J., Hanssen, R., Qubad, M., Bouzouina, A., Schack, V., Sochor, H., Schiweck, C., Aichholzer, M., Matura, S., Slattery, D. A., Zopf, Y., Borgland, S. L., Reif, A., & Thanarajah, S. E. (2023). Impact of insulin and insulin resistance on brain dopamine signalling and reward processing – An underexplored mechanism in the pathophysiology of depression? *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *149*, 105179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2023.105179

Hägele, C., Schlagenhauf, F., Rapp, M., Sterzer, P., Beck, A., Bermpohl, F., Stoy, M., Ströhle, A., Wittchen, H.-U., Dolan, R. J., & Heinz, A. (2015). Dimensional psychiatry: Reward dysfunction and depressive mood across psychiatric disorders. *Psychopharmacology*, *232*(2), 331–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00213-014-3662-7

Halahakoon, D. C., Kieslich, K., O'Driscoll, C., Nair, A., Lewis, G., & Roiser, J. P. (2020). Reward-Processing Behavior in Depressed Participants Relative to

Healthy Volunteers: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *77*(12), 1286–1295. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.2139

Hall, A. F., Browning, M., & Huys, Q. J. M. (2024). The computational structure of consummatory anhedonia. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2024.01.006

Hallschmid, M., Benedict, C., Born, J., Fehm, H.-L., & Kern, W. (2004). Manipulating central nervous mechanisms of food intake and body weight regulation by intranasal administration of neuropeptides in man. *Physiology & Behavior*, *83*(1), 55–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2004.07.023

Han, J. E., Frasnelli, J., Zeighami, Y., Larcher, K., Boyle, J., McConnell, T., Malik, S., Jones-Gotman, M., & Dagher, A. (2018). Ghrelin Enhances Food Odor Conditioning in Healthy Humans: An fMRI Study. *Cell Reports*, *25*(10), 2643-2652.e4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2018.11.026

Hong, J. S., Longoni, C., & Morwitz, V. G. (2024). Proximity bias: Interactive effect of spatial distance and outcome valence on probability judgments. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *34*(1), 18–34. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcpy.1341

Horman, T., Ayoub, S., & Leri, F. (2021). Evidence of hypoglycemic anhedonia and modulation by bupropion in rats. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*, *203*, 173120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbb.2021.173120

Husain, M., & Roiser, J. P. (2018). Neuroscience of apathy and anhedonia: A transdiagnostic approach. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, *19*(8), 470–484. https://doi.org/10.1038/S41583-018-0029-9

Huys, Q. J., Pizzagalli, D. A., Bogdan, R., & Dayan, P. (2013). Mapping anhedonia onto reinforcement learning: A behavioural meta-analysis. *Biology of Mood & Anxiety Disorders*, *3*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1186/2045-5380-3-12

Jerlhag, E. (2008). Systemic administration of ghrelin induces conditioned place preference and stimulates accumbal dopamine. *Addiction Biology*, *13*(3–4), 358–363.

Jiang, T., Soussignan, R., Schaal, B., & Royet, J.-P. (2015). Reward for food odors: An fMRI study of liking and wanting as a function of metabolic state and BMI. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *10*(4), 561–568. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsu086

Kan, C., Silva, N., Golden, S. H., Rajala, U., Timonen, M., Stahl, D., & Ismail, K. (2013). A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of the Association Between Depression and Insulin Resistance. *Diabetes Care*, *36*(2), 480–489. https://doi.org/10.2337/dc12-1442

Kanoski, S. E., & Boutelle, K. N. (2022). Food cue reactivity: Neurobiological and behavioral underpinnings. *Reviews in Endocrine and Metabolic Disorders*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11154-022-09724-x

Katz, R. J. (1982). Animal model of depression: Pharmacological sensitivity of a hedonic deficit. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*, *16*(6), 965–968. https://doi.org/10.1016/0091-3057(82)90053-3

Kaufman, J., & Charney, D. (2000). Comorbidity of mood and anxiety disorders. *Depression and Anxiety*, *12*(S1), 69–76. https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6394(2000)12:1+<69::AID-DA9>3.0.CO;2-K

Keren, H., O'Callaghan, G., Vidal-Ribas, P., Buzzell, G. A., Brotman, M. A., Leibenluft, E., Pan, P. M., Meffert, L., Kaiser, A., Wolke, S., Pine, D. S., & Stringaris, A. (2018). Reward Processing in Depression: A Conceptual and Meta-Analytic Review Across fMRI and EEG Studies. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *175*(11), 1111–1120. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.17101124

Kieslich, K., Valton, V., & Roiser, J. P. (2022). Pleasure, Reward Value, Prediction Error and Anhedonia. In D. A. Pizzagalli (Ed.), *Anhedonia: Preclinical, Translational, and Clinical Integration* (pp. 281–304). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/7854_2021_295

King, S. J., Isaacs, A. M., O'Farrell, E., & Abizaid, A. (2011). Motivation to obtain preferred foods is enhanced by ghrelin in the ventral tegmental area. *Hormones and Behavior*, *60*(5), 572–580. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.YHBEH.2011.08.006

Kleinridders, A., Cai, W., Cappellucci, L., Ghazarian, A., Collins, W. R., Vienberg, S. G., Pothos, E. N., & Kahn, C. R. (2015). Insulin resistance in brain alters dopamine turnover and causes behavioral disorders. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *112*(11), 3463–3468. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1500877112

Kluge, M., Schussler, P., Schmid, D., Uhr, M., Kleyer, S., Yassouridis, A., & Steiger, A. (2009). Ghrelin plasma levels are not altered in major depression. *Neuropsychobiology*, *59*(4), 199–204. https://doi.org/10.1159/000223731

Koopmann, A., Bach, P., Schuster, R., Bumb, J. M., Vollstädt-Klein, S., Reinhard, I., Rietschel, M., Witt, S. H., Wiedemann, K., & Kiefer, F. (2019). Ghrelin modulates mesolimbic reactivity to alcohol cues in alcohol-addicted subjects: A functional imaging study: Ghrelin and alcohol addiction. *Addiction Biology*, *24*(5), 1066–1076. https://doi.org/10.1111/adb.12651

Korn, C. W., Sharot, T., Walter, H., Heekeren, H. R., & Dolan, R. J. (2014). Depression is related to an absence of optimistically biased belief updating about future life events. *Psychological Medicine*, *44*(3), 579–592. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291713001074

Kroemer, N. B., Krebs, L., Kobiella, A., Grimm, O., Pilhatsch, M., Bidlingmaier, M., Zimmermann, U. S., & Smolka, M. N. (2013). Fasting levels of ghrelin covary with the brain response to food pictures. *Addiction Biology*, *18*(5), 855–862. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-1600.2012.00489.x

Kroemer, N. B., Opel, N., Teckentrup, V., Li, M., Grotegerd, D., Meinert, S., Lemke, H., Kircher, T., Nenadić, I., Krug, A., Jansen, A., Sommer, J., Steinsträter, O., Small, D. M., Dannlowski, U., & Walter, M. (2022). Functional Connectivity of the Nucleus Accumbens and Changes in Appetite in Patients With Depression. *JAMA Psychiatry*, *79*(10), 993–1003. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2022.2464

Kroemer, N. B., Sun, X., Veldhuizen, M. G., Babbs, A. E., de Araujo, I. E., & Small, D. M. (2016). Weighing the evidence: Variance in brain responses to milkshake receipt is predictive of eating behavior. *NeuroImage*, *128*, 273–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.12.031

Kroemer, N. B., Veldhuizen, M. G., Delvy, R., Patel, B. P., O'Malley, S. S., & Small, D. M. (2018). Sweet taste potentiates the reinforcing effects of e-cigarettes. *European Neuropsychopharmacology*, *28*(10), 1089–1102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2018.07.102

Kube, T. (2023). Biased belief updating in depression. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *103*, 102298. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2023.102298

Kullmann, S., Blum, D., Jaghutriz, B. A., Gassenmaier, C., Bender, B., Häring, H.-U., Reischl, G., Preissl, H., la Fougère, C., Fritsche, A., Reimold, M., & Heni, M. (2021). Central Insulin Modulates Dopamine Signaling in the Human Striatum. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, *106*(10), 2949–2961. https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgab410

Kullmann, S., Heni, M., Hallschmid, M., Fritsche, A., Preissl, H., & Häring, H.-U. (2016). Brain Insulin Resistance at the Crossroads of Metabolic and Cognitive

Disorders in Humans. *Physiological Reviews*, *96*(4), 1169–1209. https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00032.2015

Kurt, E., Guler, O., Serteser, M., Cansel, N., Ozbulut, O., Altınbaş, K., Alataş, G., Savaş, H., & Gecici, O. (2007). The effects of electroconvulsive therapy on ghrelin, leptin and cholesterol levels in patients with mood disorders. *Neuroscience Letters*, *426*(1), 49–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2007.08.018

Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *82*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13

Lamers, F., Vogelzangs, N., Merikangas, K. R., de Jonge, P., Beekman, A. T. F., & Penninx, B. W. J. H. (2013). Evidence for a differential role of HPA-axis function, inflammation and metabolic syndrome in melancholic versus atypical depression. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *18*(6), Article 6. https://doi.org/10.1038/mp.2012.144

Lee, J.-H., Park, S. K., Ryoo, J.-H., Oh, C.-M., Mansur, R. B., Alfonsi, J. E., Cha, D. S., Lee, Y., McIntyre, R. S., & Jung, J. Y. (2017). The association between insulin resistance and depression in the Korean general population. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *208*, 553–559. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2016.10.027

Lim, J., Wood, A., & Green, B. G. (2009). Derivation and Evaluation of a Labeled Hedonic Scale. *Chemical Senses*, *34*(9), 739–751. https://doi.org/10.1093/chemse/bjp054

Liu, H., Sarapas, C., & Shankman, S. A. (2016). Anticipatory Reward Deficits in Melancholia. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *125*(5), 631–640. https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000172

Liu, S., & Borgland, S. L. (2015). Regulation of the mesolimbic dopamine circuit by feeding peptides. *Neuroscience*, *289*, 19–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROSCIENCE.2014.12.046

Lockie, S. H., Dinan, T., Lawrence, A. J., Spencer, S. J., & Andrews, Z. B. (2015). Diet-induced obesity causes ghrelin resistance in reward processing tasks. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, *62*, 114–120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2015.08.004

Lorenzo-Luaces, L., Buss, J. F., & Fried, E. I. (2021). Heterogeneity in major depression and its melancholic and atypical specifiers: A secondary analysis of STAR*D. *BMC Psychiatry*, *21*(1), 454. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03444-3

Makovey, J., Naganathan, V., Seibel, M., & Sambrook, P. (2007). Gender differences in plasma ghrelin and its relations to body composition and bone—An opposite-sex twin study. *Clinical Endocrinology*, *66*(4), 530–537. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2265.2007.02768.x

Malik, S., McGlone, F., Bedrossian, D., & Dagher, A. (2008). Ghrelin Modulates Brain Activity in Areas that Control Appetitive Behavior. *Cell Metabolism*, *7*(5), 400–409.

Markov, D. D. (2022). Sucrose Preference Test as a Measure of Anhedonic Behavior in a Chronic Unpredictable Mild Stress Model of Depression: Outstanding Issues. *Brain Sciences*, *12*(10), Article 10. https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci12101287

Matsuo, K., Nakano, M., Nakashima, M., Watanuki, T., Egashira, K., Matsubara, T., & Watanabe, Y. (2012). Neural correlates of plasma acylated ghrelin level in individuals with major depressive disorder. *Brain Research*, *1473*, 185–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2012.07.027

Matthews, D. R., Hosker, J. P., Rudenski, A. S., Naylor, B. A., Treacher, D. F., & Turner, R. C. (1985). Homeostasis model assessment: Insulin resistance and beta-cell function from fasting plasma glucose and insulin concentrations in man. *Diabetologia*, *28*(7), 412–419. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00280883

Menzies, J., Skibicka, K., Egecioglu, E., Leng, G., & Dickson, S. (2012). Peripheral Signals Modifying Food Reward. *Handbook of Experimental Pharmacology*, *209*, 131–158. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-24716-3_6

Milaneschi, Y., Lamers, F., Berk, M., & Penninx, B. W. J. H. (2020). Depression Heterogeneity and Its Biological Underpinnings: Toward Immunometabolic Depression. *Biological Psychiatry*, *88*(5), 369–380. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2020.01.014

Milaneschi, Y., Lamers, F., Bot, M., Drent, M. L., & Penninx, B. W. J. H. (2017). Leptin Dysregulation Is Specifically Associated With Major Depression With Atypical Features: Evidence for a Mechanism Connecting Obesity and Depression. *Biological Psychiatry*, *81*(9), 807–814. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.10.023

Moradi, Y., Albatineh, A. N., Mahmoodi, H., & Gheshlagh, R. G. (2021). The relationship between depression and risk of metabolic syndrome: A meta-analysis of observational studies. *Clinical Diabetes and Endocrinology*, *7*(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40842-021-00117-8

Moreira, F. P., Jansen, K., Cardoso, T. de A., Mondin, T. C., Vieira, I. S., Magalhães, P. V. da S., Kapczinski, F., Souza, L. D. de M., da Silva, R. A., Oses, J. P., & Wiener, C. D. (2019). Metabolic syndrome, depression and anhedonia among young adults. *Psychiatry Research*, *271*, 306–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2018.08.009

Müller, F. K., Teckentrup, V., Kühnel, A., Ferstl, M., & Kroemer, N. B. (2022). Acute vagus nerve stimulation does not affect liking or wanting ratings of food in healthy participants. *Appetite*, *169*, 105813. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2021.105813

Murta, L., Seixas, D., Harada, L., Damiano, R. F., & Zanetti, M. (2023). Intermittent Fasting as a Potential Therapeutic Instrument for Major Depression Disorder: A Systematic Review of Clinical and Preclinical Studies. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *24*(21), Article 21. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms242115551

Narayanan, N. S., Guarnieri, D. J., & DiLeone, R. J. (2010). Metabolic hormones, dopamine circuits, and feeding. *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology*, *31*(1), 104–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yfrne.2009.10.004

Nguyen, D., Naffziger, E. E., & Berridge, K. C. (2021). Positive affect: Nature and brain bases of liking and wanting. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *39*, 72–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2021.02.013

Ott, T., Stein, A. M., & Nieder, A. (2023). Dopamine receptor activation regulates reward expectancy signals during cognitive control in primate prefrontal neurons. *Nature Communications*, *14*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-43271-6

Overduin, J., Figlewicz, D. P., Bennett-Jay, J., Kittleson, S., & Cummings, D. E. (2012). Ghrelin increases the motivation to eat, but does not alter food palatability. *American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology*, *303*(3), R259–R269.

Ozsoy, S., Besirli, A., Abdulrezzak, U., & Basturk, M. (2014). Serum Ghrelin and Leptin Levels in Patients with Depression and the Effects of Treatment. *Psychiatry Investigation*, *11*(2), 167–172. https://doi.org/10.4306/pi.2014.11.2.167

Padrão, G., Mallorquí, A., Cucurell, D., Marco-Pallares, J., & Rodriguez-Fornells, A. (2013). Neurophysiological differences in reward processing in anhedonics. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, *13*(1), 102–115. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-012-0119-5

Pizzagalli, D. A., Jahn, A. L., & O'Shea, J. P. (2005). Toward an objective characterization of an anhedonic phenotype: A signal-detection approach. *Biological Psychiatry*, *57*(4), 319–327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2004.11.026

Quarta, D., Di Francesco, C., Melotto, S., Mangiarini, L., Heidbreder, C., & Hedou, G. (2009). Systemic administration of ghrelin increases extracellular dopamine in the shell but not the core subdivision of the nucleus accumbens. *Neurochemistry International*, *54*(2), 89–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuint.2008.12.006

Quintana, D. S., & Williams, D. R. (2018). Bayesian alternatives for common null-hypothesis significance tests in psychiatry: A non-technical guide using JASP. *BMC Psychiatry*, *18*(1), 178. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1761-4

Radoman, M., Crane, N. A., Gorka, S. M., Weafer, J., Langenecker, S. A., de Wit, H., & Phan, K. L. (2021). Striatal activation to monetary reward is associated with alcohol reward sensitivity. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *46*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-020-0728-6

Ribot, T. (1839-1916) A. du texte. (1896). *La psychologie des sentiments / par Th. Ribot,...* https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k654204

Rogers, P. J., Drumgoole, F. D. Y., Quinlan, E., & Thompson, Y. (2021). An analysis of sensory-specific satiation: Food liking, food wanting, and the effects of distraction. *Learning and Motivation*, *73*, 101688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2020.101688

Rømer Thomsen, K., Whybrow, P. C., & Kringelbach, M. L. (2015). Reconceptualizing anhedonia: Novel perspectives on balancing the pleasure networks in the human brain. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *9*, 49. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00049

Schanze, A., Reulbach, U., Scheuchenzuber, M., Groschl, M., Kornhuber, J., & Kraus, T. (2008). Ghrelin and eating disturbances in psychiatric disorders. *Neuropsychobiology*, *57*(3), 126–130. https://doi.org/10.1159/000138915

Scheggi, S., De Montis, M. G., & Gambarana, C. (2018). Making Sense of Rodent Models of Anhedonia. *International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology*, *21*(11), 1049–1065. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyy083

Schneider, E., Spetter, M. S., Martin, E., Sapey, E., Yip, K. P., Manolopoulos, K. N., Tahrani, A. A., Thomas, J. M., Lee, M., Hallschmid, M., Rotshtein, P., Dourish, C. T., & Higgs, S. (2022). The effect of intranasal insulin on appetite and mood in women with and without obesity: An experimental medicine study. *International Journal of Obesity*, *46*(7), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41366-022-01115-1

Schulz, C., Vezzani, C., & Kroemer, N. B. (2023). How gut hormones shape reward: A systematic review of the role of ghrelin and GLP-1 in human fMRI. *Physiology & Behavior*, *263*, 114111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2023.114111

Schwarz, K., Moessnang, C., Schweiger, J. I., Baumeister, S., Plichta, M. M., Brandeis, D., Banaschewski, T., Wackerhagen, C., Erk, S., Walter, H., Tost, H., & Meyer-Lindenberg, A. (2020). Transdiagnostic Prediction of Affective, Cognitive, and Social Function Through Brain Reward Anticipation in Schizophrenia, Bipolar Disorder, Major Depression, and Autism Spectrum Diagnoses. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, *46*(3), 592–602. https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbz075

Scinska, A., Sienkiewicz-Jarosz, H., Kuran, W., Ryglewicz, D., Rogowski, A., Wrobel, E., Korkosz, A., Kukwa, A., Kostowski, W., & Bienkowski, P. (2004). Depressive symptoms and taste reactivity in humans. *Physiology & Behavior*, *82*(5), 899–904. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2004.07.012

Sharot, T. (2011). The optimism bias. *Current Biology*, *21*(23), R941–R945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.10.030

Shi, Y.-Y., Zheng, R., Cai, J.-J., & Qian, S.-Z. (2021). The association between triglyceride glucose index and depression: Data from NHANES 2005–2018. *BMC Psychiatry*, *21*(1), 267. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03275-2

Simmons, W. K., Burrows, K., Avery, J. A., Kerr, K. L., Taylor, A., Bodurka, J., Potter, W., Teague, T. K., & Drevets, W. C. (2020). Appetite changes reveal depression subgroups with distinct endocrine, metabolic, and immune states. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *25*(7), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-018-0093-6

Simon, J. J., Wetzel, A., Sinno, M. H., Skunde, M., Bendszus, M., Preissl, H., Enck, P., Herzog, W., & Friederich, H.-C. (2017). Integration of homeostatic signaling and food reward processing in the human brain. *JCI Insight*, *2*(15). https://doi.org/10.1172/jci.insight.92970

Skibicka, K. P., Hansson, C., Alvarez-Crespo, M., Friberg, P. A., & Dickson, S. L. (2011). Ghrelin directly targets the ventral tegmental area to increase food motivation. *Neuroscience*, *180*, 129–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2011.02.016

Smith, C. T., Dang, L. C., Cowan, R. L., Kessler, R. M., & Zald, D. H. (2016). Variability in paralimbic dopamine signaling correlates with subjective responses to d-amphetamine. *Neuropharmacology*, *108*, 394–402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropharm.2016.05.004

Snaith, R. P., Hamilton, M., Morley, S., Humayan, A., Hargreaves, D., & Trigwell, P. (1995). A Scale for the Assessment of Hedonic Tone the Snaith–Hamilton Pleasure Scale. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *167*(1), 99–103. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.167.1.99

So, W. L., Hu, J., Jeffs, L., Dempsey, H., Lockie, S. H., Zigman, J. M., Stark, R., Reichenbach, A., & Andrews, Z. B. (2023). *Ghrelin signalling in AgRP neurons links metabolic state to the sensory regulation of AgRP neural activity* (p. 2023.05.28.542625). bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.28.542625

Stouffer, M. A., Woods, C. A., Patel, J. C., Lee, C. R., Witkovsky, P., Bao, L., Machold, R. P., Jones, K. T., de Vaca, S. C., Reith, M. E. A., Carr, K. D., & Rice, M. E. (2015). Insulin enhances striatal dopamine release by activating cholinergic interneurons and thereby signals reward. *Nature Communications*, *6*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9543

Swiecicki, L., Zatorski, P., Bzinkowska, D., Sienkiewicz-Jarosz, H., Szyndler, J., & Scinska, A. (2009). Gustatory and olfactory function in patients with unipolar and bipolar depression. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, *33*(5), 827–834. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2009.03.030

Takamura, M., Okamoto, Y., Okada, G., Toki, S., Yamamoto, T., Ichikawa, N., Mori, A., Minagawa, H., Takaishi, Y., Fujii, Y., Kaichi, Y., Akiyama, Y., Awai, K., & Yamawaki, S. (2017). Patients with major depressive disorder exhibit reduced reward size coding in the striatum. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, *79*, 317–323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2017.07.006

Teckentrup, V., & Kroemer, N. B. (2023). Mechanisms for survival: Vagal control of goal-directed behavior. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.11.001

Tiedemann, L. J., Schmid, S. M., Hettel, J., Giesen, K., Francke, P., Büchel, C., & Brassen, S. (2017). Central insulin modulates food valuation via mesolimbic pathways. *Nature Communications*, *8*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms16052

Tramunt, B., Smati, S., Grandgeorge, N., Lenfant, F., Arnal, J.-F., Montagner, A., & Gourdy, P. (2020). Sex differences in metabolic regulation and diabetes susceptibility. *Diabetologia*, *63*(3), 453–461. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-019-05040-3

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. *PLoS ONE*, *4*(8). https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0006598

Treadway, M. T., & Zald, D. H. (2011). Reconsidering anhedonia in depression: Lessons from translational neuroscience. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *35*, 537–555. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2010.06.006

Uher, R., Perlis, R. H., Henigsberg, N., Zobel, A., Rietschel, M., Mors, O., Hauser, J., Dernovsek, M. Z., Souery, D., Bajs, M., Maier, W., Aitchison, K. J., Farmer, A., & McGuffin, P. (2012). Depression symptom dimensions as predictors of antidepressant treatment outcome: Replicable evidence for interest-activity symptoms. *Psychological Medicine*, *42*(5), 967–980. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291711001905

Unger, G., Benozzi, S. F., Perruzza, F., & Pennacchiotti, G. L. (2014). Triglycerides and glucose index: A useful indicator of insulin resistance. *Endocrinologia Y Nutricion: Organo De La Sociedad Espanola De Endocrinologia Y Nutricion*, *61*(10), 533–540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.endonu.2014.06.009

Verharen, J. P. H., de Jong, J. W., Zhu, Y., & Lammel, S. (2023). A computational analysis of mouse behavior in the sucrose preference test. *Nature Communications*, *14*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-38028-0

Volkow, N. D., Wang, G.-J., Fowler, J. S., Logan, J., Jayne, M., Franceschi, D., Wong, C., Gatley, S. J., Gifford, A. N., Ding, Y.-S., & Pappas, N. (2002). "Nonhedonic" food motivation in humans involves dopamine in the dorsal striatum and methylphenidate amplifies this effect. *Synapse*, *44*(3), 175–180. https://doi.org/10.1002/syn.10075

Vrieze, E., Pizzagalli, D. A., Demyttenaere, K., Hompes, T., Sienaert, P., de Boer, P., Schmidt, M., & Claes, S. (2013). Reduced Reward Learning Predicts Outcome in Major Depressive Disorder. *Biological Psychiatry*, *73*(7), 639–645. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.10.014

Wang, S., Leri, F., & Rizvi, S. J. (2021). Anhedonia as a central factor in depression: Neural mechanisms revealed from preclinical to clinical evidence. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry*, *110*, 110289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpbp.2021.110289

Webb, C. A., Murray, L., Tierney, A. O., Forbes, E. E., & Pizzagalli, D. A. (2023). Reward-related predictors of symptom change in behavioral activation therapy for anhedonic adolescents: A multimodal approach. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *48*(4), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-022-01481-4

Whitton, A. E., Kumar, P., Treadway, M. T., Rutherford, A. V., Ironside, M. L., Foti, D., Fitzmaurice, G., Du, F., & Pizzagalli, D. A. (2023). Distinct profiles of anhedonia and reward processing and their prospective associations with quality of life among individuals with mood disorders. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41380-023-02165-1

Willame, H., Wacquier, B., Point, C., Dosogne, M., Al Faker, M., Loas, G., & Hein, M. (2022). The association between type 2 diabetes and anhedonic subtype of major depression in hypertensive individuals. *The Journal of Clinical Hypertension*, *24*(2), 156–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/jch.14411

Williams, J., & Terman, M. (2003). *STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR THE HAMILTON DEPRESSION RATING SCALE with Atypical Depression Supplement (SIGH-ADS 2003)*.

Yeomans, M. R. (1996). Palatability and the micro-structure of feeding in humans: The appetizer effect. *Appetite*, *27*(2), 119–133. https://doi.org/10.1006/appe.1996.0040