Blunted Reward Prediction Error Encoding Drives Diminished Motivation to Explore in Apathy Associated With Traumatic Brain Injury

Authors: Dr. Jeremy Hogeveen[1], Ethan Campbell[1], Denicia Aragon[2], Ebony Pearson[3], Caitlin Enders[1], John Romero[1], Lauren Brown[1], Dr. Richard A. Campbell[4], Ms. Darbi Gill[4], Dr. Davin K. Quinn[4], Dr. Masud Husain[5-7], Dr. Andrew R. Mayer[1,8-9], & Dr. Vincent D. Costa[10-11]

Affiliations:

1. Department of Psychology & Psychology Clinical Neuroscience Center, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA.
2. Department of Psychology, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, USA.
3. Department of Psychology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37240, USA.
4. Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA.
5. Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, OX2 6GG, UK.
6. Wellcome Centre for Integrative Neuroimaging, University of Oxford, OX3 9DU, UK.
7. Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Oxford, OX3 9DU, UK.
8. Department of Neurology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA.
9. Mind Research Network/Lovelace Biomedical Research Institute, Albuquerque, NM 87106, USA.
10. Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Emory University, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA.
11. Division of Developmental and Cognitive Neuroscience, Emory National Primate Research Center, Atlanta, GA 30329, USA.

Abstract

Clinical apathy might result from either a diminished willingness to exert effort for known rewards or from reduced motivation to explore potentially beneficial future opportunities. To identify the underlying cognitive and neural bases of apathy, we used task-based fMRI to examine motivated choice computations in patients with chronic traumatic brain injury (TBI)—a condition frequently associated with apathy—and compared their behavior and neural activity to that of healthy controls (CTRLs). Participants performed two choice tasks involving distinct types of motivational tradeoffs: i) An effort-value tradeoff task (the 'Apples Task') requiring them to decide how much physical effort they were willing to exert for varying reward magnitudes, and ii) An explore-exploit tradeoff task (the 'Novelty-Bandit Task') requiring them to choose between exploiting options with a known history of reward or exploring novel options with uncertain but potentially higher future value. Across both TBI and CTRL, higher apathy was associated with steeper effort-based discounting of rewards. This behavioral pattern was linked to heightened neural encoding of effort costs in a common network including central somatomotor areas, midcingulate, middle insula, and putamen across both TBI and CTRL. In contrast, the explore-exploit task revealed a neurocomputational signature of apathy unique to TBI. Apathy in TBI was not associated with an impaired ability to learn the immediate expected value of choices, but with a specific reduction in the latent valuation of gaining information about future rewards. This behavioral deficit was directly tied to blunted encoding of reward prediction errors (RPEs) when participants' received feedback about their choices in frontopolar cortex (FPC), ventromedial prefrontal cortex, cingulate, insula, and dorsal and ventral striatum. These findings suggest a dual-mechanism account of apathy. While an aversion to effort may be a transdiagnostic feature of apathy, clinical apathy acquired after a TBI may be uniquely characterized by an impairment in future-oriented decision making. Optimistic valuation of uncertain choice opportunities elicits RPE when decisions to explore those opportunities are rewarded or unrewarded. We propose that blunted RPE encoding in prefrontal cortex and basal ganglia in TBI degrades a crucial teaching signal—preventing the individual from learning about the benefits of engaging in directed exploration of novel options, thereby diminishing their motivation to explore again in the future. This specific deficit in outcome monitoring and brain networks that encode RPEs at feedback highlights a potential target for neuromodulatory interventions aimed at rescuing motivation in patients with TBI.

Keywords: Apathy; Motivation; Traumatic Brain Injury; fMRI; Decision-Making; Explore-Exploit.

Introduction

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) often results in chronic and disruptive neuropsychiatric symptoms[1]. These can include a reduced motivation to engage in goal-directed behaviors—commonly known as apathy[2–4]. While clinically recognized as a major impediment to recovery and quality of life[4,5], the precise cognitive and neural mechanisms of apathy remain under debate. An unresolved question is whether apathy stems from an aversion to effort, a general impairment in value-based learning, or a deficit in the drive to explore novel opportunities for future benefit.

Recent years have seen considerable advances in understanding the neural mechanisms of motivated decision-making in normative samples[6–8]. Yet, there is a comparative lack of basic neuroscience research into the mechanisms that elevate risk for amotivation following a TBI event. Applying insights from decision neuroscience to clinical populations is critical for identifying meaningful dissociations that can explain complex symptoms like apathy[2,9–11]. For example, a decreased willingness to exert physical effort for rewards is a well-documented feature of apathy, observed in both patients with Parkinson's Disease (PD) and in subclinical apathy in healthy individuals (CTRLs)[12,13]. There also may be some basic decreases in reward sensitivity and reward-based learning associated with clinical apathy in both PD[14,15] and TBI[2,16,17]. Notably, exploiting choices with high, well-learned reward values requires relatively low cognitive effort. In contrast, tracking uncertainty in the reward environment and deciding when it is appropriate to seek out novel information—a form of 'directed exploration'[18,19]—requires its own form of effort. This distinction is critical, as a reduced motivation to explore novel options that may lead to greater future rewards has not been studied in TBI-related apathy. Therefore, it remains unclear if apathy in TBI is driven primarily by an aversion to physical effort, impaired reward-based learning, or a specific impairment in the motivation to engage in directed exploration of prospective rewards.

There are several lines of evidence suggesting that clinical apathy may affect the exploration of new opportunities. For example, when healthy participants are given dopamine agonists prior to performing a 'Patch Foraging' task they more readily explore new locations when the expected value in their current location is low[20]. This finding directly mirrors the impact of dopamine agonists on novelty-directed exploration in nonhuman primates (NHPs)[21]. Relatedly, patients with PD-related apathy demonstrate more 'random' exploration and impaired value learning on a task where learning to exploit familiar choice options is cognitively demanding[15]. Degeneration or pharmacological manipulation of dopaminergic circuitry may therefore modulate motivated behavior not only by shifting effort-based decision-making for rewards, but also by changing one's motivation to gain new information about the environment through exploration.

To investigate these possibilities, we used functional MRI (fMRI) and two distinct decision-making tasks in healthy volunteers and patients with chronic TBI. To probe physical effort-based decision-making, we used an 'Apples Task,' where participants decided whether to exert varying levels of physical effort for different reward magnitudes[13]. To examine the trade-off between exploiting familiar rewards based on their known value versus exploring new possibilities to reduce uncertainty, we used a 'Novelty-Bandit Task'[22–24]. The Novelty Bandit required choices between familiar options with a known reward history and novel options with uncertain future value. Because prior studies have rarely examined exploration alongside the exploitation of well-learned values, they may have missed a key functional dissociation relevant to understanding clinical apathy. We hypothesized that—in line with prior studies in PD and CTRLs—reduced willingness to exert physical effort for rewards would represent a general, transdiagnostic

dimension of apathy. We also hypothesized specific dimensions of apathy in TBI would be associated with deficits in cognitively effortful directed exploration, which may or may not be related to subclinical apathy in CTRLs.

Our findings support these hypotheses. While a greater reluctance to expend physical effort for rewards was linked to apathy across TBI patients and CTRLs, a reduced motivation to explore was specifically associated with apathy in the TBI group. This was tied to a blunted reward prediction error signal in key motivational brain regions in TBI patients with increased apathy—providing strong evidence that this neurocomputational signal is involved in translating value learning into the motivation to explore. These results provide a more precise framework for understanding acquired amotivation, pointing to potential new avenues for treating a symptom that profoundly interferes with daily life in TBI.

Materials and Methods

Participants

A total of *N*=49 chronic TBI participants were recruited from the local Albuquerque community, alongside *N*=21 non-brain-injured control participants (CTRLs). We removed several subjects due to insufficient responding during our decision-making tasks (*N*=3), absence of reported loss of consciousness events during a semi-structured interview for the TBI group (*N*=2; see **Semi-structured TBI interview** section), incomplete or unavailable apathy questionnaire data (*N*=17), or excessive head motion during one or both fMRI tasks (*N*=2; i.e., 2SD above sample mean framewise displacement). Some participants were excluded for 1 or more of these reasons. This lead to a final sample of *N*=34 TBI patients and *N*=19 CTRLs (**Table 1**). The final TBI and CTRL groups differed in age (**Table 1**). Notably, age was not associated with our primary behavioral and neuropsychiatric outcomes, and was not included as a covariate in corresponding behavioral models. Given well-documented age-related changes in the hemodynamic response[25], however, age *was* included as a covariate (alongside mean framewise displacement) in all group fMRI models. Informed consent was documented for all participants in the study, which was approved by the UNM Health Science Center's Human Research Protections Office.

Table 1. Final sample characteristics. TBI and CTRL columns report mean +/- SD except where otherwise indicated. Inferential tests comprised Welch's *t*-tests for comparisons that were normally distributed but with unequal variance between groups, and Mann-Whitney *U*-tests for comparisons that were not normally distributed. Alternative hypothesis for each test is that CTRL<TBI. Acronyms: NSI (neurobehavioral symptom index), BDI (Beck depression inventory), BAI (Beck anxiety inventory), BIS (Barratt impulsivity scale), and FD (framewise displacement).

	TBI	CTRL	INFERENTIAL TEST
N	34	19	N/A
Age	**39.7+/-10.7**	**28.1+/-10.08**	***U*=143.5, *p*<0.001**
Female (prop.)	0.42	0.38	X^2=0.076, *p*=0.782
Years of Ed. (mean+/-SD)	15.3+/-2.84	16.2+/-2.76	*U*=341.5, *p*=0.212
NSI	**27.2+/-19.2**	**5.83+/-5.93**	***U*=74.0, *p*<0.001**
BDI	**13.2+/-10.43**	**4.5+/-3.97**	***U*=127.5, *p*<0.001**
BAI	**17.1+/-11.76**	**6.5+/-8.15**	***U*=107.0, *p*<0.001**
BIS	**67.4+/-11.6**	**55.6+/-7.73**	***t*=46.4, *p*<0.001**
Bandit FD	0.24+/-0.16	0.18+/-0.06	*U*=284.0, *p*=0.239
Effort FD	0.25+/-0.14	0.21+/-0.07	*U*=294.0, *p*=0.427

Clinical Assessments

TBI assessment. *Pre-screening.* All

participants in the current study were pre-screened over the phone to confirm that they did (TBI) or did not (CTRL) have a history of brain injury. If participants reported a recent (i.e., <3 months) TBI during pre-screening, they were not enrolled in the study until a later date. All TBI subjects were in the late chronic post-injury phase at enrollment (≥6 months). The median time since injury across the sample was 110.47 months (*SD*=83.41 months).

Semi-structured interview. On the day of the study visit, participants completed a modified version of the Rivermead semi-structured interview to determine TBI history and severity[26,27]. Participants included in the CTRL sample reported no TBI history. In the TBI sample, only participants reporting at least one TBI event involving a loss of consciousness (LOC) were included in the final sample. Of those patients, a significant proportion reported more than one TBI (*N*=20/34). The majority of the described injuries were classified as mild [mTBI; LOC < 30 minutes and post-traumatic amnesia (PTA) < 1 day[28]; *N*=26/34]. A subset of the patients reported at least one moderate-to-severe TBI (msTBI; LOC>30m or PTA>1 day[28]; *N*=8/34). Repeated versus single mTBI was not associated with incidental findings on structural MRI (X^2=0.05, *p*=0.82), while msTBI participants *were* more likely to have a positive structural MRI finding relative to mTBI (X^2=6.98, *p*=0.008). The increased proportion of incidental structural MRI findings in msTBI relative to mTBI cases supported the construct validity of the TBI history interview for identifying cases with more severe head trauma.

Clinical assessments. To ensure participant compliance and effort during cognitive testing we administered the Test of Memory Malingering (TOMM[29]) and ensured scores above 45 at the start of the study visit. We also administered the Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory (NSI[30]) to assess the type and severity of postconcussive symptoms the severity of post-concussive symptoms, as well as the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI[31]), Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI[32]), and Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS) to provide additional measures of psychiatric symptoms post-injury. We measured both the Apathy Evaluation Scale (AES[33]) and the Apathy Motivation Index (AMI[34]) to assess dimensions of amotivation in the current sample. AES was included for consistency with the prior literature since it has been used in most existing studies of apathy, but AMI was considered the primary apathy outcome as it has been rigorously psychometrically evaluated. The AMI provides measures for three subdomains of apathy (behavioral activation, emotional sensitivity, and social motivation), which can also be combined to generate a total apathy score.

Decision-Making Tasks

Stimulus presentation and timing during fMRI scans were controlled using EPrime Version 3 (Psychology Software Tools, Sharpsburg, PA), and manual responses were recorded using the MIND Input Device (https://www.mrn.org/collaborate/mind-input-device).

Apples task. We used a physical effort-based decision-making for reward task, modeled after one that has been used extensively in previous studies of behavioral apathy in healthy participants and neurological patients[12,13] (**Figure 1A**). Prior to fMRI, participants made a series of 10s duration grips of a dynamometer at varying levels of maximum effort (i.e., percentage maximum voluntary contraction, % MVC). Levels were either 20, 40, 60, 80, or 100% MVC, and each grip intensity was practiced for 10s with a roughly 20-30s inter-grip rest interval. Participants were then told that during the fMRI task they were going to make a series of effort-value tradeoff decisions based on the levels of % MVC that they had just practiced. On each choice trial, effort

levels ranged from 20%-100% MVC (5 levels: 20, 40, 60, 80, and 100), and reward value levels ranging from 1-13 points (5 levels: 1, 4, 7, 10, and 13). Each Effort/Value combination was repeated three times per fMRI run (75 trials per run), repeated across two fMRI runs (150 total trials per subject).

On each trial, participants had 3000 ms to respond 'yes' (i.e., Accept the effort-value tradeoff) or 'no' (i.e., Reject the effort-value tradeoff). Rather than have participants execute real dynamometer grips for each offer they accepted during the fMRI run, responses were recorded with discrete button presses, to avoid the potential confound of summed BOLD activity driven by 10s duration isometric muscle contractions which would necessitate a lengthy return-to-baseline after each trial. Critically, participants were instructed that they would be required to execute a random subset of the % MVC grips that they accepted to earn the corresponding values after completion of the fMRI runs. There should be no reason to over- or under-estimate one's willingness-to-exert physical effort in this setup, similar to the approach used extensively in studies of willingness-to-pay in value-based choice[35]. Indeed, this story was sufficient to clearly recreate the canonical effort-based discounting effect observed on this paradigm (**Figure 1B**). Intertrial intervals were jittered (1000-7000ms) to optimize HRF deconvolution at the time of response.



Figure 1. Overview of fMRI Tasks and Derived Measures. (A) Apples Task: An effort-based decision-making task that trained participants to exert grips at varying percentages of their maximum voluntary contraction (MVC), then required them to say whether they Accept or Reject various physical effort-reward value tradeoffs during fMRI (two 75-trial runs; 150 total trials). **(B)** There was a significant interaction between effort and value in predicting the probability of Accepting the offers (***: p<0.001) suggesting that participants demonstrated an effort-based discounting effect—i.e., requiring higher reward values to Accept offers at levels of physical effort. **(C)** Novelty-Bandit Task: A probabilistic reinforcement learning task in which participants choose among three options with low, medium, or high reward probabilities. After several trials, a novel stimulus replaces one familiar option, a process that occurs seven times per fMRI run (four 40-trial runs; 160 total trials). **(D)** After novel insertions, participants were equally likely to explore (choose the novel option) or exploit (choose the best familiar option; NS: P+=0.166), and over time became increasingly exploitative (***: p<0.001). A normative model (partially observable Markov decision process (POMDP)) fit behavioral data well, with large effect size correlations between the model and observed choice behavior that did not differ across TBI and CTRL (T: P+=0.068).

Bandit task. *Task description.* We used a version of our Novelty Bandit Task[24] (**Figure 1C**). The Novelty Bandit is a 3-armed probabilistic reinforcement learning task involving periodic novel stimulus insertions that cue participants to make explore-exploit decisions. On each trial (160 total trials), participants selected one of three neutral images from the International Affective Picture System (IAPS[36]) via right-handed button presses. Participants completed four bandit task fMRI runs, each comprising 40 trials. At the start of each fMRI run, three images were selected at

random and assigned a nominal probability of reward—low (p=0.2), medium (p=0.5), or high (p=0.8). Participants learned to select the most rewarding options over a series of responses based on positive (green '+1') or neutral (black '-0') feedback after each choice. The response window was fixed at 3000ms, and responses recorded after this period would receive a 'No Response!' feedback event. After each response, there was a jittered inter-stimulus (ISI; 1000-4000ms) interval, and then feedback was presented for 1500 ms. Finally, a fixation cross was presented centrally for a jittered inter-trial interval (ITI; 1000-12000ms). ISI and ITI jitters were optimized separately using the genetic algorithm tool[37], enabling us to deconvolve the hemodynamic responses (HRF) at the time of choice *and* feedback.

After ≈4-9 trials (randomized interval; *Median*=6) a novel stimulus was inserted in place of one of the familiar images, and assigned its own low, medium, or high reward probability. This occurred seven times per block, for 28 total novel stimulus insertion trials across all fMRI runs. Participants were told that they could earn an additional reward if they accumulated enough points in the task, ensuring a high level of motivation to optimize decision-making in the task. Choice behavior in this task was similar to previous studies using the paradigm[24,38]—i.e., participants were similarly likely to explore ($p_{explore}$=0.39) and exploit ($p_{exploit}$=0.42) when novel stimuli are dropped in (*Median Difference*=0.03, *95%-CI*=-0.03 to 0.10, *P+*[1]=0.83; **Figure 1D**), both of which were more commonly observed than choosing the worst familiar alternative ($p_{worst=}$0.18; *Explore Median Difference*=0.21, *95%-CI*=0.16 to 0.27, *P+*=1.0; *Exploit Median Difference*=0.24, *95%-CI*=0.19 to 0.30, *P+*=1.0; **Figure 1D**). Participants also tended to learn to exploit the best available options more as a function of trials after a novel option was dropped in—providing clear evidence of learning (b=0.07, *95%-CI*=0.04 to 0.11). Position was randomized on each trial, and all options were presented centrally near fixation to minimize saccade-related BOLD artifacts.

Computational modeling. Optimal decision strategies on the Novelty Bandit Task were fit using a partially observable Markov decision process (POMDP) model that has been described in depth elsewhere[23,24]. Briefly, the POMDP estimates the value of all three options based on the summed likelihood that a particular action will be rewarded based on its reinforcement history (i.e., its Immediate Expected Value, IEV), and a latent estimation of the discounted sum of future rewards that can be obtained given the reward values present in the choice set (i.e., the Future Expected Value, FEV). In the POMDP framework, the decision to exploit familiar rewards is thought to be motivated by maximizing IEV, whereas the decision to explore novel and uncertain choice options is thought to be motivated by an information bonus—i.e., a higher FEV for a given option relative to its alternatives (i.e., BONUS). This BONUS parameter is high for novel stimuli, but decreases over time once the option has been sampled. The POMDP model fit observed choice behavior well in both TBI patients (r=0.68) and CTRL participants (r=0.78), with a trend towards a higher correlation in CTRLs (*Median Difference*=0.10, *95%-CI*=-0.03 to 0.23, *P+*=0.94; **Figure 1D**).

Magnetic Resonance Imaging Methods

Image acquisition and fMRIPrep preprocessing. Imaging data was acquired on a Siemens Prisma 3T system with a 32-channel phased-array head coil. T1-weighted structural images were acquired via multi-echo MPRAGE sequence (5-echo; voxel size=1mm iso). TBI

[1] *P+*: Proportion of posterior estimates above 0. *P-*: Proportion of posterior estimates below 0.

participants also completed T2-weighted, FLAIR, and susceptibility-weighted imaging which were included for neuroradiology but not analyzed. Echo-planar imaging data was collected during the task fMRI runs with a TR=1s, TE=30ms, flip angle=44, multiband factor=4, and a voxel size of 3mm iso. All MRI data were then converted to the Brain Imaging Data Structure (BIDS[39]) before preprocessing. Results included in this manuscript come from preprocessing performed using fMRIPrep 20.2.0rc0[40,41] (RRID:SCR_016216), which is based on Nipype 1.5.1[42,43] (RRID:SCR_002502). This fMRIPrep anatomical and functional preprocessing boilerplate for this version of the software is documented in full in Hogeveen et al., 2021[44].

fMRI modeling. *Apples Task.* Binary response regressors time-locked to the choice cue and with duration equal to the response time[45] were modeled for Accept events (i.e., 'yes' responses at choice time) and Reject events (i.e., 'no' response at choice time). Instantaneous parametric regressors were also included for the value of accepted offers, the effort level of accepted offers, the value of rejected offers, and the effort level of rejected offers. The model design was therefore constructed to extract brain regions that parametrically scaled their BOLD signal with option value (across accept and reject) and effort level (across accept and reject). To isolate the neural computations underlying the effort-value tradeoff, at the trial-level, we modeled the interaction between decision (Accept vs. Reject events) and the key drivers of that decision (Value vs. Effort parametric regressors; **Figure 3B**). Regions showing a positive effect of this interaction increased their activity as a function of Value on Accept trials, and as a function of Effort on Reject trials (e.g., vmPFC in **Figure 3B**). This pattern suggests these regions represent the subjective, effort-discounted value of the chosen option, flexibly tracking the decisive factor motivating the decision—i.e., Value on Accept trials, and Effort on Reject trials. In contrast, regions showing a negative interaction effect did the inverse, increasing activity as a function of Effort on Accept trials, and Value on Reject trials (e.g., dACC in **Figure 3B**). We interpret this pattern as a neural signature of cognitive conflict and/or choice difficulty during effort-based decision-making for rewards[46]. Specifically, these regions track the costs associated with the decision: the effort one must exert when accepting a difficult offer, and the value one must forgo when rejecting a tempting one.

Novelty Bandit. First-level models of the Novelty Bandit data mirrored the model-based analyses we have previously published using trial-level value estimates from the POMDP[24]. Each trial was modeled with a response event boxcar regressor that onset at choice cue and offset at response onset[45]. Response-locked instantaneous regressors were also fit using parametric weighting as a function of the BONUS, FEV, IEV, trials since a novel insertion, and the occurrence of a reward on the previous trial. A parametric regressor for reward prediction error (RPE; i.e., feedback minus IEV) at the time of feedback was also included. Parametric weights were demeaned around a meaningful central value (e.g. 0.5 for IEV, 0 for BONUS, initial FEV for FEV, etc.). This first-level design allowed us to identify brain regions that encoded the values of exploration (BONUS) and exploitation (IEV) at the time of choice, and RPE at feedback time. Each regressor was fit with linear basis functions from FSL to accommodate variability in HRF shape[47]. Confound regressors included the standard 6 motion parameters (*x*, *y*, and *z* translational and rotational movements relative to a single band reference image), with each parameter expanded using temporal and quadratic derivatives (MP24[48]). Data were smoothed with a 5mm kernel, and a 100s high-pass temporal filter was applied. Group-level models were estimated via wholebrain mixed effects modeling in FSL's FLAME1[49], with cluster-extent thresholding at $z \geq 2.3$ and $p_{FWE} \leq 0.05$.

Results

Apathy and Other Chronic Symptoms in TBI

Chronic TBI patients reported significant post-concussive symptoms relative to CTRLs, measured via the NSI (p<0.001; **Table 1**). Additionally, TBI patients reported higher levels of depression, anxiety, and impulsivity (all ps<0.001; **Table 1**). These findings are consistent with prior literature on chronic psychiatric sequelae in TBI[1]. Within the TBI sample, repeated injuries were associated with increased neurobehavioral symptoms (NSI—Repeated TBI: M=33.2±12.4; Single TBI: M=17.2±13.5; t=2.72, p=0.011), anxiety (BAI—Repeated TBI: M=21.3±12.4; Single TBI: M=10.1±6.29; t=3.39, p=0.002), and impulsiveness (BIS—Repeated TBI: M=70.7±10.3; Single TBI: M=61.8±11.7; t=2.20, p=0.039), but did not impact depression (BDI—Repeated TBI: M=15.1±11.2; Single TBI: M=10.0±8.41; p=0.155) relative to a single TBI event. Notably, none of these psychiatric symptoms differed significantly between individuals with mTBI vs. msTBI (all ps>0.259), consistent with existing evidence that repeated injuries can be more predictive of the degree of chronic postconcussive psychiatric symptoms than injury severity[50,51].



Figure 2. Apathy scales by group. (A) AES and AMI mean and standard error. TBI increased on AES cognitive, AMI behavioral, AMI emotional, and AMI total. **(B)** Distribution of apathy scores, averaged across AES and AMI subscales. Notes: **: P+≤0.01; *:P+≤0.05; ^{T}:P+≤0.1; ^{NS}:P+≥0.3.

Consistent with our own prior work[44] and existing meta-analyses[3,4], clinical apathy was observed across the spectrum of TBI in the current sample. Bayesian t-tests[52] were used to contrast the groups on each of the subscales as well as the total (mean) score on the apathy evaluation scale (AES) and apathy motivation index (AMI). On the AES apathy in TBI was higher on most dimensions relative to CTRL, with the most credible evidence for group differences on the AES behavioral, cognitive, and total measures (**Table 2**; **Figure 2**). A similar pattern was observed on the AMI, with the largest posterior effect sizes on the behavioral apathy subscale as well as the AMI total score (**Table 2**; **Figure 2**). Within TBI, apathy scores were not impacted by repeated injury, nor were they impacted differently in msTBI versus mTBI.

Effort-Based Discounting of Rewards is Related to Clinical and Subclinical Apathy

Table 2. Apathy measurements. Descriptive and inferential stats from the apathy evaluation scale (AES) and apathy motivation index (AMI) separated by group. Note: *Med*=median; *HDI*=95%-high density interval; *P*-=Proportion of posterior estimates below 0. Any comparison where *P*- ≤0.05 indicated credible evidence for an increased apathy score in TBI relative to CTRL group.

	TBI	CTRL	Posterior Effect Size
AES Behavioral	*Med*=9.1 *HDI*=8.3-10	*Med*=8.0 *HDI*=7.0-9.2	*d*=-0.49 *HDI*=-1.2 to 0.17; *P*-=0.07
AES Cognitive	*Med*=14 *HDI*=12-15	*Med*=12 *HDI*=10-13	*d*=-0.54 *HDI*=-1.1 to 0.05; *P*-=0.04
AES Emotional	*Med*=3.9 *HDI*=3.4-4.4	*Med*=4.0 *HDI*=3.4-4.6	*d*=0.06 *HDI*=-0.53 to 0.64; *P*-=0.58
AES Other	*Med*=5.7 *HDI*=5.0-6.5	*Med*=5.5 *HDI*=4.6-6.4	*d*=-0.13 *HDI*=-0.74 to 0.48; *P*-=0.34
AES Total (Mean)	*Med*=8.2 *HDI*=7.4-9.0	*Med*=7.4 *HDI*=6.6-8.2	*d*=-0.40 *HDI*=-0.99 to 0.18; *P*-=0.09
AMI Behavioral	*Med*=1.8 *HDI*=1.5-2.0	*Med*=1.3 *HDI*=0.91-1.7	*d*=-0.69 *HDI*=-1.4 to 0.007; *P*-=0.02
AMI Emotional	*Med*=1.3 *HDI*=1.1-1.5	*Med*=1.0 *HDI*=0.79-1.3	*d*=-0.49 *HDI*=-1.1 to 0.11; *P*-=0.05
AMI Social	*Med*=1.7 *HDI*=1.4-1.9	*Med*=1.4 *HDI*=1.1-1.7	*d*=-0.41 *HDI*=-1 to 0.18; *P*-=0.09
AMI Total (Mean)	*Med*=1.6 *HDI*=1.4-1.7	*Med*=1.3 *HDI*=1.1-1.5	*d*=-0.72 *HDI*=-1.4 to -0.09; *P*-=0.01

Effort-based choice in TBI and CTRL. Bayesian multilevel logistic regression models were fit on binarized responses (Accept=1; Reject=0) on the effort-based decision-making for rewards task. In the main effect model, trial-by-trial responses were fit as a function of fixed effects of apples (i.e., number of rewards), effort level, (i.e., %MVC level required to obtain reward), and group (i.e., binarized factor, with TBI=1, CTRL=0), and a random intercept was fit for subject. In an interaction model, we added a three-way interaction term to determine whether the impact of effort on reward-based decision-making might differ as a function of TBI. All Bayesian multilevel choice models were fit using the 'brms' package in R, used 4 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains with 2000 iterations per chain, and the convergence criterion was $\hat{R} < 1.05$. In line with what we anticipated in this paradigm, there was credible statistical evidence for main effects of both effort level (*b*=-0.96, *95%-CI*=-1.02 to -0.91) and reward value/number of apples (*b*=0.33, *95%-CI*=0.32 to 0.35), and an interaction between reward and effort (*b*=0.03, *95%-CI*= 0.02 to 0.05) on the probability of Accept responses (**Figure 1B**). There was no main effect of TBI group—TBI and CTRL participants were similarly likely to accept offers across the task (*b*=-0.29, *95%-CI*=-1.16 to 0.59). There was, however, a credible three-way interaction between effort, value, and group (*b*=0.06, *95%-CI*=0.03 to 0.10). This interaction was driven by TBI patients discounting rewards more steeply at lower effort levels relative to CTRL.

Behavioral indices of effort-based discounting in apathy. We then determined whether apathy was associated with effort-based discounting of rewards in TBI and CTRL. To quantify individual differences in effort-based discounting, we fit a generalized linear mixed-effects model with a binomial link function to the trial-level response data from the Apples task. The model included a fixed intercept and subject-specific random intercepts and slopes for the interaction between reward magnitude (i.e., Apples) and physical effort level. This allowed us to estimate how each participant's 'Accept' thresholds were modulated by the interaction of reward magnitude and effort costs.

We extracted both the random intercepts and slopes for the reward by effort interaction, to operationalize baseline acceptance probability across these parameters (intercept) and effort-based discounting of rewards (slope). Visual examination of model results revealed that individuals with a positive slope were willing to Accept the significant majority of offers when reward value was high, but individuals with a negative random slope remained unwilling to Accept

at high effort levels irrespective of the available reward (**Supplemental Figure 1**). Therefore, more negative slopes reflected a greater degree of effort-based discounting of reward magnitude.



Figure 3. Effort-Based Discounting Correlates of Apathy Across TBI and CTRL. **(A)** Bayesian multiple regression models yielded credible evidence for a main effect of apathy on effort-based discounting of rewards—such that higher apathy scores lead to greater degree of effort-based discounting. **(B)** Wholebrain map of the interaction between choice event (Accept versus Reject decisions) and relevant choice parameter (Value versus Effort). This revealed evidence for positive responses reflecting effort-discounted value encoding in ventromedial prefrontal cortex, temporo-parieto-occipital junction regions, lateral intraparietal area, and the dorsal striatum. Negative responses to this interaction term likely reflected the degree of choice conflict or difficulty and this was encoded in a large section of dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and dorsomedial prefrontal cortex, dorsolateral and ventrolateral prefrontal regions, and insular cortex. **(C)** Apathy total scores were positive associated with effort encoding across TBI and CTRL participants in a network including central somatomotor areas, midcingulate, middle insula, and putamen. **(D)** This association was driven by a credible positive correlation between apathy scores and BOLD scaling with the effort parameter across both groups. Notes: ***: *P*+≥0.99 or ≤0.001; **: *P*+≥0.95 or ≤0.01. ROI labels from the HCP multimodal parcellation (Glasser et al., 2016, *Nature*).

Both baseline acceptance (intercept) and effort discounting (slope) parameters were then modeled as a function of total apathy scores, group, and their interaction in a Bayesian multiple regression via *brms* in R. There was no credible statistical evidence that apathy, TBI group, or their interaction affected baseline acceptance—indicating that these variables did not uniformly decrease or increase choice across levels of value and effort. There was a credible main effect of apathy on effort-based discounting of rewards (*b*=-0.18, *95%-CI*=-0.30 to -0.07). The main effect of group and the interaction term did not credibly impact effort discounting. In general, the main effects model was driven by a similar negative association, whereby increased apathy was associated with steeper effort-based discounting of rewards across *both* TBI (ρ=-0.43, *HDI*=-0.71 to -0.08, *P*+=0.01) and CTRL (ρ=-0.35, *HDI*=-0.72 to 0.11, *P*+=0.08) groups (**Figure 3A**).

Neural correlates of effort-based discounting of rewards. A wholebrain map revealed that effort-discounted value was encoded in ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), lateral intraparietal cortex (LIP), temporo-parieto-occipital junction (TPOJ), subcentral area 43, and the putamen. Notably, in some regions (e.g. LIP, TPOJ, and putamen; **Figure 3B**) this was driven by a combination of increased Value encoding on Accept relative to Reject trials, and increased Effort encoding on Reject relative to Accept trials (**Supplemental Figure 2A**), whereas in others it was

driven by either a Value encoding effect on Accept trials (e.g. vmPFC; **Supplemental Figure 2B**) or an Effort encoding effect on Reject trials (e.g. area 43; **Supplemental Figure 2C**). In contrast, choice difficulty was encoded in an extended anterior cingulate / dorsomedial frontal cluster, anterior and middle insula, and both dorsal and ventral regions of lateral prefrontal cortex (**Figure 3B**). In most of these regions this was driven by a combination of increased Value encoding on Reject trials and Effort encoding on Accept trials (**Supplemental Figure 2D**).

Across both TBI patients and controls, higher apathy was associated with increased BOLD signal that tracked the required effort level in a network of regions including pre- and post-central sulcal regions, subcentral area 43, middle insular area, and the putamen (**Figure 3C**). This effect was specific to effort encoding, not associated with value or the interaction between effort and choice. There was a robust positive correlation between AMI total scores and BOLD scaling with the effort parameter across choice types in both TBI (ρ=0.47,*P+*=0.99; **Figure 3D**) and CTRL (ρ=0.48,*P+*=0.98; **Figure 3D**) groups. Conversely, there was no credible relationship between apathy and BOLD scaling with the value parameter in either group in these ROIs (TBI: ρ=0.05,*P+*=0.39; CTRL: ρ=-0.35,*P+*=0.08; **Figure 3D**). This suggests that individuals with higher apathy exhibit a heightened neural sensitivity to effort, which may drive their behavioral tendency to discount prospective rewards more steeply as a function of physical effort costs.

Explore-Exploit Differences Were Specifically Related to Apathy in TBI But Not CTRL

Explore-exploit decision-making in TBI and CTRL. In the first two trials after a novel stimulus was presented, participants were more likely to exploit the best available familiar option (*Med*=0.42, *HDI*=0.38-0.47) or explore the novel option (*Med*=0.39, *HDI*=0.34-0.44) than they were to select the worst familiar alternative (*Med*=0.18, *HDI*=0.15-0.21; Chose best versus chose worst: *d*=1.9, *HDI*=1.3 to 2.4, *P+*=1.0; Novel versus worst: *d*=1.6, *HDI*=1.1 to 2.2, *P*+=1.0; **Figure 1D**). Participants demonstrated a similar probability of exploiting (choosing the best alternative) and exploring (choosing the novel stimulus) on early choice trials (*d*=0.21, *HDI*=-0.18 to 0.63, *P*+=0.84; **Figure 1D**). Bayesian multilevel models with a logistic (Bernoulli) fitting function were run on trialwise choice outcomes using the 'brms'[53] library in R. Separate models were fit for 'chose best' (i.e., exploit) and 'chose novel' (i.e., explore) binary outcomes. These outcomes were predicted as a function of two fixed effects: 1) the number of trials since a novel stimulus was inserted into the choice set (ordinal values: 0-5) and 2) group (dummy variable: TBI=1, CTRL=0). A random intercept was added to account for subject. Both exploit and explore models were repeated with an interaction term, to determine whether the number of trials since a novel stimulus was inserted predicts choice behavior variably as a function of group.

All Bayesian multilevel choice models used 4 Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains with 2000 iterations per chain, and convergence criterion was $\hat{R} < 1.05$. For 'chose best,' there was a main effect of trials since novel (*b*=0.04, *95%-CI*=0.04 to 0.11; **Figure 1D**) indicating that subjects *learned* to exploit familiar rewards, and a main effect of group (*b*=-0.41, *95%-CI*=-0.77 to -0.04) reflecting greater exploitation in CTRL relative to TBI**.** There was no credible evidence for an interaction effect. For 'chose novel,' there was a significant negative effect of trials since a novel option (*b*=-0.06, *95%-CI*=-0.10 to -0.02; **Figure 1D**) reflecting decreased novelty-directed exploration across time, but the effect of group and the interaction term were not credibly supported by the data.

Beyond choice probabilities, we fit normative POMDP models of explore-exploit decision-making in line with our prior work on this paradigm[24]. The POMDP model correlated well with observed choices across TBI (*Med r*=0.69, *HDI*=0.59 to 0.79, *P+*=1.0; **Figure 1D**) and CTRL (*Med r*=0.79, *HDI*=0.70 to 0.87, *P+*=1.0; **Figure 1D**). There was also trend-level evidence that the POMDP fit differed by group (*d*=0.43, *HDI*=0.13 to 0.97, *P+*=0.94; **Figure 1D**). In line with the 'chose best' model, the difference in model fit was related to a decrease in IEV weighting in TBI (*Med*=0.72, *HDI*=0.56 to 0.87) relative to CTRL (*Median*=1.20, *95%-HDI*=0.76-1.70; *d*=0.69, *95%-HDI*=0.021 to 1.30, *P+*=0.981). The groups did not differ in their weighting of the BONUS parameter.

Diminished exploration selectively correlates with behavioral and emotional apathy in TBI. Subject-level estimates for weighting the value of exploiting (IEV) and exploring (BONUS) options were derived via the POMDP. To test the hypothesis that explore-exploit behavior is driven by specific components of apathy, we used Bayesian multiple linear regression models to examine the main effects of each AMI apathy dimension (behavioral, emotional, social) and TBI group on these IEV and BONUS estimates. Subsequent models assessed the interaction between each apathy dimension and TBI group.

No credible main effects of apathy scores (on any dimension) or TBI group were found for either the IEV or BONUS parameter estimates. However, two statistically credible interactions emerged when predicting the BONUS parameter: both behavioral and emotional apathy domains interacted with TBI group (**Figure 4A**). These interactions were driven by individuals with TBI and higher behavioral or emotional (but not social) apathy demonstrating reduced motivation to explore when the BONUS was high (AMI Behave: ρ=-0.36, *95%-CI*=-0.68 to -0.02, *P+*=0.03; AMI Emotion: ρ=-0.46, *95%-CI*=-0.73 to -0.11, *P+*=0.009; AMI Social: ρ=0.28, *95%-CI*=-0.10 to 0.61, *P+*=0.91; **Figure 4A**). BONUS was not associated with any AMI subscales in the CTRL group (AMI Behave: ρ=0.05, *P+*=0.58; AMI Emotion: ρ=0.28, *P+*=0.87; AMI Social: ρ=0.16, *P+*=0.74; **Figure 4A**).

A credible interaction was also observed when predicting the immediate expected value (IEV; i.e., value of exploiting a familiar option) parameter. This was characterized by CTRL participants with increased behavioral apathy exhibiting heightened weighting of the IEV parameter (AMI Behave: ρ=0.46, *95%-CI*=0.03 to 0.80, *P+*=0.97; **Figure 4B**). Notably—greater IEV weighting on the Bandit task was associated with a reduced willingness to Accept high effort options in the Apples task across subjects (**Supplementary Figure 3**). This IEV by AMI behavior correlation in the CTRL group may therefore reflect a similar generalized bias towards low effort choices and greater apathy in CTRLs across tasks. No other apathy dimensions were associated with IEV in either group.

Behavioral and computational results from the explore-exploit task suggest that apathetic TBI is characterized by a reduced drive to explore novel options. Model-based analysis of the fMRI data provided some evidence about the neural mechanisms driving this effect. Specifically, this analysis centered on neural encoding of the RPE at feedback time. A wholebrain map found a distributed set of prefrontal, temporoparietal, cingulate, amygdala, and striatal regions that positively encoding RPEs, as well as negative RPE encoding in a region of dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (**Figure 4C**).



Figure 4. Novelty-Bandit Correlates of Acquired Apathy in TBI. (A-B) Bayesian multiple regression models yielded credible evidence for apathy by TBI group interaction on bonus, driven by negative associations between behavioral and emotional apathy and bonus in TBI, but no associations between bonus and social apathy in TBI, and no credible associations between apathy and bonus in CTRLs. There was a credible interaction between behavioral apathy and TBI group on IEV, with more apathetic CTRL participants demonstrating greater weighting of IEV, but no associations between apathy and IEV in TBI. **(C)** Wholebrain map of reward prediction error (RPE) encoding across both TBI and CTRL participants. Positive RPE encoding observed in ventromedial and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex, insula, ventral and dorsal stream visual areas, posterior cingulate, amygdala, and striatum. A region in dorsal anterior cingulate cortex was also found to negatively encode RPE. **(D)** There was a significant interaction between emotional apathy scores and TBI status on RPE BOLD encoding, driven by blunted RPE encoding in several areas of prefrontal cortex, insula, rostral anterior cingulate cortex, lateral prefrontal and frontopolar cortices, right temporoparietal regions, and the striatum. Notes: *: *P*+>0.95 or <0.05; **: *P*+>0.99 or <0.01. ROI labels from the HCP multimodal parcellation (Glasser et al., 2016, *Nature*).

When examining the relationship between apathy and brain activity, we found an interaction between emotional AMI scores and TBI group. Specifically, higher emotional AMI scores in TBI patients were associated with reduced RPE encoding in regions of the frontopolar cortex (FPC), dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC), salience network (anteroventral and middle insula, rostral anterior cingulate), ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), nucleus accumbens (NAC), and caudate (CAU; **Figure 4D**). In each case, they were driven by blunted RPE encoding as a function of apathy in the TBI group and a lack of correlation between RPE encoding and apathy in CTRLs (**Figure 4D**). These clusters mostly scaled in the same direction with behavioral apathy (**Figure 4D**), but only emotional apathy survived multiple comparisons

correction. Monitoring the value of competing goals at feedback time is crucial for shaping adaptive decision-making and likely plays a key role in goal-directed exploration[54,55]. Therefore, the current results suggest a specific blunting of the degree of reward prediction error encoding in key motivational, salience network, and prefrontal regions in TBI may specifically drive diminished directed exploration and apathy in this population.

Discussion

Does apathy in TBI reflect a reduced willingness to exert effort for known rewards, or a diminished motivation to explore new information for unknown *future* benefit? The present study dissociates these mechanisms, revealing that—while there is a general association between apathy and effort minimization across TBI and CTRL groups on both fMRI tasks—clinical apathy in TBI is uniquely characterized by decreased directed exploration to gain new information. These findings point to a dual-mechanism account of apathy, with specific implications for understanding and treating the motivational deficits that frequently follow TBI and other neurological disorders.

A failure to normatively weigh physical effort costs against the anticipated benefits of our actions has previously been linked to apathy across Parkinson's Disease (PD), small vessel cerebrovascular disease[56], and healthy control participants[12,13]. The current findings replicate this general pattern and extend it to the context of TBI-related apathy. Across both individuals with TBI and healthy controls, higher total apathy scores were related to a greater effort-based discounting of rewards. This behavior was mirrored by activity in a specific brain network involving somatomotor areas, midcingulate, middle insula, and the putamen. Crucially, cortico-insular and striatal circuits are known to encode subjective value expectations and the violation of those expectations during effortful tasks[57]. Our findings suggest that in more apathetic individuals, this network shows an exaggerated BOLD response to increasing effort demands. This hypersensitivity to effort costs may overwhelm the representation of potential rewards, providing a direct neural mechanism for the observed increase in effort-based discounting in individuals with higher total apathy across both TBI and CTRL.

A core component of adaptive behavior in primates is curiosity—the drive to gain information, reduce uncertainty about the future, and seek novel experiences[58,59]. Our findings suggest that TBI-related apathy involves a specific disruption of this process. Behaviorally, while both TBI and CTRL participants learned to exploit familiar rewarding options, individuals with TBI and higher apathy showed a reduced motivation to engage in directed exploration of novel, uncertain choices. Our model-based fMRI analysis identified a clear neural correlate for this deficit: a blunted reward prediction error (RPE) signal at the time of feedback. This RPE signal was attenuated in apathetic TBI patients across a network including the frontopolar cortex (FPC), ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), and striatum. vmPFC and striatum encoding of RPEs aligns well with recent meta-analyses of RPE encoding in humans[60,61]. These effects were in the same direction for both behavioral and emotional apathy—but were particularly robust with respect to emotional apathy. Recent machine learning-based deconstruction of the apathy phenotype recently found that emotional apathy is unique relative to the other domains, and is the only AMI domain that *is not* associated with depression or anhedonia[62]. This study also found that emotional apathy was associated with a core deficit in processing the *intensity* of emotionally salient information[62]. This accords with current results—diminished RPE encoding as a function of increased emotional apathy suggests that individuals with this symptom have a decreased neural encoding of the relative *intensity* of rewarding feedback.

The finding that this signal is blunted in FPC in apathetic individuals with a diminished motivation to engage in directed exploration is particularly noteworthy. The FPC is not only critical for exploration and other forms of information-seeking[24,63–66], but also for the 'supervised control' required to monitor progress through a sequence of tasks that are not habitual or low effort[67,68]. A failure to properly encode RPEs in the FPC may create a dual deficit: it impairs the ability to learn the value of exploration, while also disrupting the capacity to monitor when a strategic shift away from simple exploitation in a choice sequence is necessary, leading to the inertia characteristic of apathy. This could also play a role in driving comorbid motivated choice pathologies commonly observed post-TBI—including TBI-associated increases in addiction[69] and obsessive-compulsive disorder[70].

The current findings are a striking contrast with recent work by Gilmour and colleagues (2024) on explore-exploit decision-making and apathy in Parkinson's Disease (PD)[15]. Using a bandit task, Gilmour et al. observed reduced value-based learning as a function of apathy in PD, driving apathetic PD patients to make more noisy decisions, otherwise known as 'random exploration'. Notably, Gilmour et al. used a four-armed 'Restless Bandit Task'—where reward probabilities were continuously changing, making learning to exploit familiar rewards a cognitively demanding task. Our 'Novelty-Bandit Task,' in contrast, was designed so that exploiting the best familiar option was a stable, low-effort strategy. The key challenge in our Novelty Bandit paradigm is to track uncertainty in the reward environment and evaluate the potential informational gain of an exploratory choice (i.e., 'directed exploration'). Hence, while Gilmour et al. found apathy in PD is associated with a failure to maintain a stable value learning signal among a constantly shifting reward environment, our results indicate that—in a choice task where learning to exploit requires *less* cognitive effort than the difficult decision to explore novel options[cf., 71]—clinically-acquired apathy may be more related to a specific failure to explore new information for unknown future benefit.

Consistent with previous reports[4,72,73], our TBI cohort exhibited elevated levels of chronic post-concussive symptoms, depression, anxiety, and impulsivity compared to controls. Furthermore, within the TBI group, repeated injuries exacerbated neurobehavioral symptoms, anxiety, and impulsivity, aligning with evidence suggesting cumulative effects can be more impactful than single injury severities for certain chronic psychiatric outcomes[1]. Crucially, however, apathy severity itself, measured using both the AES and AMI scales, was elevated across the TBI spectrum but did not significantly vary with injury repetition or severity (mTBI vs. msTBI) in our sample. This underscores apathy as a prevalent and potentially distinct consequence of TBI, necessitating dedicated mechanistic investigation beyond simply indexing injury characteristics.

This study provides novel evidence dissociating two distinct neurocomputational mechanisms contributing to apathy following TBI. A specific deficit in computing RPEs during motivated choice appeared to disrupt the ability of individuals with apathy post-TBI to know when it is most advantageous to explore novel and potentially beneficial choice options. These findings have significant implications for understanding and potentially treating apathy after TBI. They move beyond characterizing apathy simply as reduced willingness-to-exert effort or blunted reward valuation, providing a distinct computational target: The prospective devaluation of uncertain choice options that may be beneficial in the future. Future behavioral, pharmacologic, and

neurostimulation based interventions for apathy should therefore consider focusing on normalizing the flexible exploration of novel and unfamiliar choice options in patients with TBI.

Acknowledgements

While conducting this work, JH was supported by National Institutes of Health through the National Institute of General Medical Sciences award number P20GM109089, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism award number R01AA030283, and the National Science Foundation award number #2237795. We would like to thank the UNM Center for Advanced Research Computing, supported in part by the National Science Foundation, for providing the research computing resources used in this work.

References

1. Mayer AR, Quinn DK. Neuroimaging Biomarkers of New-Onset Psychiatric Disorders Following Traumatic Brain Injury. *Biological Psychiatry*. 2022;91(5):459-469. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2021.06.005

2. Hogeveen J, Hauner KK, Chau A, Krueger F, Grafman J. Impaired valuation leads to increased apathy following ventromedial prefrontal cortex damage. *Cerebral Cortex*. 2017;27:1401-1408.

3. Worthington A, Wood RL. Apathy following traumatic brain injury: A review. *Neuropsychologia*. 2018;118:40-47. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.04.012

4. Green SL, Gignac GE, Watson PA, et al. Apathy and Depression as Predictors of Activities of Daily Living Following Stroke and Traumatic Brain Injuries in Adults: A Meta-Analysis. *Neuropsychol Rev*. 2022;32(1):51-69. doi:10.1007/s11065-021-09501-8

5. Arnould A, Rochat L, Azouvi P, Van der Linden M. Apathetic symptom presentations in patients with severe traumatic brain injury: Assessment, heterogeneity and relationships with psychosocial functioning and caregivers' burden. *Brain Injury*. 2015;29(13-14):1597-1603. doi:10.3109/02699052.2015.1075156

6. Summerfield C, Parpart P. Normative principles for decision-making in natural environments. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2022;73:53-77.

7. Averbeck BB, Costa VD. Motivational neural circuits underlying reinforcement learning. *Nature Neuroscience*. 2017;20(4):505-512. doi:10.1038/nn.4506

8. Rangel A, Clithero JA. The Computation of Stimulus Values in Simple Choice. In: Glimcher P, Fehr E, eds. 2nd ed. Academic Press; 2014:125-147.

9. Le Heron C, Apps. MAJ, Husain M. The anatomy of apathy: A neurocognitive framework for amotivated behaviour. *Neuropsychologia*. 2018;118:54-67. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2017.07.003

10. Husain M, Roiser JP. Neuroscience of apathy and anhedonia: a transdiagnostic approach. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2018;19(8):470-484. doi:10.1038/s41583-018-0029-9

11. Knutson KM, Dal Monte O, Raymont V, Wassermann EM, Krueger F, Grafman J. Neural correlates of apathy revealed by lesion mapping in participants with traumatic brain injuries. *Human Brain Mapping*. 2014;35:943-953. doi:10.1002/hbm.22225

12. Chong TTJ, Bonnelle V, Manohar S, et al. Dopamine enhances willingness to exert effort for reward in Parkinson's disease. *Cortex*. 2015;69:40-46. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2015.04.003

13. Bonnelle V, Manohar S, Behrens T, Husain M. Individual Differences in Premotor Brain Systems Underlie Behavioral Apathy. *Cereb Cortex*. Published online November 12, 2015:bhv247. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhv247

14. Muhammed K, Manohar S, Ben Yehuda M, et al. Reward sensitivity deficits modulated by dopamine are associated with apathy in Parkinson's disease. *Brain*. 2016;139(10):2706-2721. doi:10.1093/brain/aww188

15. Gilmour W, Mackenzie G, Feile M, et al. Impaired value-based decision-making in Parkinson's disease apathy. *Brain*. 147(4):1362-1376.

16. Quang H, Le Heron C, Balleine B, et al. Reduced Sensitivity to Background Reward Underlies Apathy After Traumatic Brain Injury: Insights From an Ecological Foraging Framework. *Neuroscience*. 2023;528:26-36. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2023.07.026

17. Camille N, Griffiths CA, Vo K, Fellows LK, Kable JW. Ventromedial frontal lobe damage disrupts value maximization in humans. *The Journal of Neuroscience*. 2011;31:7527-7532. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.6527-10.2011

18. Wilson RC, Geana A, White JM, Ludvig EA, Cohen JD. Humans use directed and random exploration to solve the explore-exploit dilemma. *J Exp Psychol Gen*. 2014;143:2074-2081. doi:10.1037/a0038199

19. Wilson RC, Bonawitz E, Costa VD, Ebitz RB. Balancing exploration and exploitation with information and randomization. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*. 2021;38:49-56. doi:10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.10.001

20. Le Heron C, Kolling N, Plant O, et al. Dopamine Modulates Dynamic Decision-Making during Foraging. *J Neurosci*. 2020;40(27):5273-5282. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2586-19.2020

21. Costa VD, Tran VL, Turchi J, Averbeck BB. Dopamine modulates novelty seeking behavior during decision making. *Behavioral Neuroscience*. 2014;128(5):556-566. doi:10.1037/a0037128

22. Djamshidian A, O'Sullivan SS, Wittmann BC, Lees AJ, Averbeck BB. Novelty seeking behaviour in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia*. 2011;49(9):2483-2488. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.04.026

23. Costa VD, Mitz AR, Averbeck BB. Subcortical Substrates of Explore-Exploit Decisions in Primates. *Neuron*. 2019;103(3):533-545. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2019.05.017

24. Hogeveen J, Mullins TS, Romero JD, et al. The neurocomputational bases of explore-exploit decision-making. *Neuron*. 2022;110(11):1869-1879.

25. West KL, Zuppichini MD, Turner MP, et al. BOLD hemodynamic response function changes significantly with healthy aging. *NeuroImage*. 2019;188:198-207. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.12.012

26. King NS, Crawford S, Wenden FJ, Moss NEG, Wade DT. The Rivermead Post Concussion Symptoms Questionnaire: a measure of symptoms commonly experienced after head injury and its reliability. *J Neurol*. 1995;242(9):587-592. doi:10.1007/BF00868811

27. Mayer AR, Hanlon FM, Claus ED, et al. An Examination of Behavioral and Neuronal Effects of Comorbid Traumatic Brain Injury and Alcohol Use. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*. 2018;3(3):294-302. doi:10.1016/j.bpsc.2017.09.012

28. Silverberg ND, Iverson GL, Cogan A, et al. The American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine Diagnostic Criteria for Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2023;104(8):1343-1355. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2023.03.036

29. Tombaugh TN. Test of memory malingering. Published online 1995.

30. Cicerone K, Kalmar K. Persistent postconcussion syndrome: The structure of subjective complaints after mild traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 1995;10(3):1-17.

31. Beck AT. *Manual for the Beck Depression Inventory-II*. The Psychological Corporation; 1996.

32. Beck AT, Brown G, Epstein N, Steer RA. An Inventory for Measuring Clinical Anxiety: Psychometric Properties. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1988;56(6):893-897.

33. Marín RS, Biedrzycki RC, Firinciogullari S. Reliability and validity of the apathy evaluation scale. *Psychiatry Research*. 1991;38:143-162. doi:10.1016/0165-1781(91)90040-V

34. Ang YS, Lockwood P, Apps MAJ, Muhammed K, Husain M. Distinct Subtypes of Apathy Revealed by the Apathy Motivation Index. Gulinello M, ed. *PLoS ONE*. 2017;12(1):e0169938. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169938

35. Becker GM, DeGroot MH, Marschak J. Measuring utility by a single-response sequential method. *Behavioral Science*. 1964;9:226-232.

36. Bradley MM, Lang PJ. The International Affective Picture System (IAPS) in the study of emotion and attention. In: *Handbook of Emotion Elicitation and Assessment*. Oxford University Press; 2007:29-46.

37. Wager TD, Nichols TE. Optimization of experimental design in fMRI: a general framework using a genetic algorithm. *NeuroImage*. 2003;18(2):293-309. doi:10.1016/S1053-8119(02)00046-0

38. Campbell EM, Singh G, Claus ED, et al. Electrophysiological Markers of Aberrant Cue-Specific Exploration in Hazardous Drinkers. *CPSY*. 2023;7(1). doi:10.5334/cpsy.96

39. Gorgolewski KJ, Auer T, Calhoun VD, et al. The brain imaging data structure, a format for organizing and describing outputs of neuroimaging experiments. *Sci Data*. 2016;3(1):160044. doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.44

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

41. Esteban O, Blair R, Markiewicz CJ, et al. fMRIPrep. *Software*. Published online 2018. doi:10.5281/zenodo.852659

42. Gorgolewski K, Burns CD, Madison C, et al. Nipype: a flexible, lightweight and extensible neuroimaging data processing framework in Python. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*. 2011;5:13. doi:10.3389/fninf.2011.00013

43. Gorgolewski KJ, Esteban O, Markiewicz CJ, et al. Nipype. *Software*. Published online 2018. doi:10.5281/zenodo.596855

44. Hogeveen J, Aragon DF, Rogge-Obando K, et al. Ventromedial Prefrontal-Anterior Cingulate Hyperconnectivity and Resilience to Apathy in Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of Neurotrauma*. Published online March 31, 2021:neu.2020.7363. doi:10.1089/neu.2020.7363

45. Grinband J, Wager TD, Lindquist M, Ferrera VP, Hirsch J. Detection of time-varying signals in event-related fMRI designs. *Neuroimage*. 2008;43(3):509-520. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.07.065

46. Shenhav A, Straccia MA, Cohen JD, Botvinick MM. Anterior cingulate engagement in a foraging context reflects choice difficulty, not foraging value. *Nature Neuroscience*. 2014;17:1249-1254. doi:10.1038/nn.3771

47. Jenkinson M, Beckmann CF, Behrens TE, Woolrich MW, Smith SM. FSL. *NeuroImage*. 2012;62:782-790. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.09.015

48. Satterthwaite TD, Elliott MA, Gerraty RT, et al. An improved framework for confound regression and filtering for control of motion artifact in the preprocessing of resting-state functional connectivity data. *NeuroImage*. 2013;64(1):240-256. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.08.052

49. Woolrich MW, Behrens TEJ, Beckmann CF, Jenkinson M, Smith SM. Multilevel linear modelling for FMRI group analysis using Bayesian inference. *NeuroImage*. 2004;21(4):1732-1747. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.12.023

50. Dams-O'Connor K, Spielman L, Singh A, et al. The Impact of Previous Traumatic Brain Injury on Health and Functioning: A TRACK-TBI Study. *Journal of Neurotrauma*. 2013;30(24):2014-2020. doi:10.1089/neu.2013.3049

51. Fann JR, Burington B, Leonetti A, Jaffe K, Katon WJ, Thompson RS. Psychiatric Illness Following Traumatic Brain Injury in an Adult HealthMaintenance Organization Population. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2004;61(1):53-61. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.61.1.53

52. Bååth R. Bayesian first aid: A package that implements Bayesian alternatives to the classical*. test functions in R. In: *Proceedings off UseR!*. ; 2014.

53. Bürkner PC. Advanced Bayesian Multilevel Modeling with the R Package brms. *The R Journal*. 2018;10(1):395. doi:10.32614/RJ-2018-017

54. Tsujimoto S, Genovesio A, Wise SP. Frontal pole cortex: encoding ends at the end of the endbrain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2011;15(4):169-176. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2011.02.001

55. Hogeveen J, Medalla M, Ainsworth M, et al. What Does the Frontopolar Cortex Contribute to Goal-Directed Cognition and Action? *J Neurosci*. 2022;42(45):8508-8513. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1143-22.2022

56. Saleh Y, Le Heron C, Petitet P, et al. Apathy in small vessel cerebrovascular disease is associated with deficits in effort-based decision making. *Brain*. 2021;144(4):1247-1262. doi:10.1093/brain/awab013

57. Arulpragasam AR, Cooper JA, Nuutinen MR, Treadway MT. Corticoinsular circuits encode subjective value expectation and violation for effortful goal-directed behavior. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2018;115(22):E5233-E5242. doi:10.1073/pnas.1800444115

58. Kidd C, Hayden BY. The Psychology and Neuroscience of Curiosity. *Neuron*. 2015;88(3):449-460. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2015.09.010

59. Monosov IE. Curiosity: primate neural circuits for novelty and information seeking. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2024;25(3):195-208. doi:10.1038/s41583-023-00784-9

60. Corlett PR, Mollick JA, Kober H. Meta-analysis of human prediction error for incentives, perception, cognition, and action. *Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2022;47(7):1339-1349. doi:10.1038/s41386-021-01264-3

61. Garrison J, Erdeniz B, Done J. Prediction error in reinforcement learning: A meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 2013;37(7):1297-1310. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.03.023

62. Zhao S, Ye R, Sen A, et al. On the relationships between apathy, depression and anhedonia. Published online March 30, 2025. doi:10.31234/osf.io/3gztp_v1

63. Badre D, Doll BB, Long NM, Frank MJ. Rostrolateral Prefrontal Cortex and Individual Differences in Uncertainty-Driven Exploration. *Neuron*. 2012;73(3):595-607. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2011.12.025

64. Daw ND, O'Doherty JP, Dayan P, Seymour B, Dolan RJ. Cortical substrates for exploratory decisions in humans. *Nature*. 2006;441:876-879. doi:10.1038/nature04766

65. Kobayashi K, Kable JW. Neural mechanisms of information seeking. *Neuron*. 2024;112(11):1741-1756. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2024.04.008

66. Zajkowski WK, Kossut M, Wilson RC. A causal role for right frontopolar cortex in directed, but not random, exploration. *eLife*. 2017;6:e27430. doi:10.7554/eLife.27430

67. Desrochers TM, Chatham CH, Badre D. The Necessity of Rostrolateral Prefrontal Cortex for Higher-Level Sequential Behavior. *Neuron*. 2015;87(6):1357-1368. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2015.08.026

68. Desrochers TM, Burk DC, Badre D, Sheinberg DL. The Monitoring and Control of Task Sequences in Human and Non-Human Primates. *Front Syst Neurosci*. 2016;9. doi:10.3389/fnsys.2015.00185

69. Bjork JM, Grant SJ. Does Traumatic Brain Injury Increase Risk for Substance Abuse?

70. Grados MA. Obsessive-compulsive disorder after traumatic brain injury. *International Review of Psychiatry*. 2009;15:350-358.

71. Averbeck BB. Theory of choice in bandit, information sampling and foraging tasks. *PLoS Comput Biol*. 2015;11:e1004164. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004164

72. McHugh L, Wood RL. Using a temporal discounting paradigm to measure decision-making and impulsivity following traumatic brain injury: A pilot study. *Brain Injury*. 2008;22:715-721. doi:10.1080/02699050802263027

73. Hsieh MY, Ponsford J, Wong D, Schönberger M, Taffe J, Mckay A. Motivational interviewing and cognitive behaviour therapy for anxiety following traumatic brain injury: A pilot randomised controlled trial. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*. 2012;22(4):585-608. doi:10.1080/09602011.2012.678860