Running title: Prosocial effort in AD risk

The neural basis of prosocial effort-based decision making in older adults at risk for Alzheimer's disease

Caitlin S. Walker[1], Garance Barnoin[2], Mitchell Bennett[2], Colleen Hughes[3], Jennifer Tremblay-Mercier[4], R. Nathan Spreng[1,4,5,6], Judes Poirier[4], Laurel S. Morris[7,10,11], the PREVENT-AD Research Group, Sylvia Villeneuve[1,4,5,6], & Maiya R. Geddes[1,4,5,6,8,9]

1. The Neuro, Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
2. Department of Arts and Science, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada.
3. Psychological and Brain Sciences Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA
4. Centre for Studies in the Prevention of Alzheimer's Disease, Douglas Mental Health Institute, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada.
5. McConnell Brain Imaging Centre (BIC), MNI, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
6. McGill University Research Centre for Studies in Aging, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
7. Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, USA
8. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
9. Rotman Research Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
10. Nuffield Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom
11. Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

Running title: Prosocial effort in AD risk

Abstract

Background: Alzheimer's disease is associated with impairments in decision making that undermine autonomy, health behaviors, and quality of life. Effort-based decision making, the process of weighing reward value against effort costs, is particularly disrupted in aging and Alzheimer's disease. However, aging is also characterized by a shift toward socioemotional and prosocial goals, which may preserve motivation and effortful behavior. Understanding prosocial effort-based decision making and its neural substrates in individuals at risk for AD may reveal early alterations in decision making and neural circuits that support healthy aging.

Methods: Fifty-two older adults from the PREVENT-AD cohort (mean age = 68.48, 38 females, 18 *APOE4* carriers) completed an effort-based decision-making task comparing willingness to exert effort for rewards obtained for oneself or for charity. Decision response, response time, and vigor were analyzed using mixed-effects models. Reward–effort relationships were modeled using psychometric functions and compared using random-effects Bayesian model comparison, with parameter estimates from the winning model compared between conditions and between *APOE4* carriers and non-carriers. Seed-to-voxel resting-state functional connectivity from the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate cortex examined neural substrates of prosocial effort-based decision making, and ROI-to-ROI connectivity between regions of a frontostriatal reward network was compared between *APOE4* carriers and non-carriers.

Results: Participants showed increased acceptance of effort for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards. The relationship between reward and effort in both conditions was best captured by a sigmoid function, with lower motivation for self-oriented compared to prosocial rewards. Across all participants, higher motivation for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards was associated with resting-state functional connectivity to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate cortex. *APOE4* carriers showed lower overall motivation than non-carriers, but higher vigor when exerting effort for prosocial than self-oriented rewards, along with reduced nucleus accumbens–dorsal anterior cingulate connectivity that was associated with lower motivation for effort.

Conclusions: Prosocial incentives may be an effective strategy for motivating effortful behavior in older adults at risk for Alzheimer's disease. Although *APOE4* carriers show greater aversion to accepting effort for both reward types, they exhibit heightened vigor when working for

prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards. Leveraging prosocial motivation and its underlying neural circuitry may therefore represent a promising strategy to sustain goal-directed behavior and decision making, promote physical and cognitive activity, and support emotional and brain health in at-risk aging.

Key words: Motivation; Effort discounting; Reward processing; Preclinical Alzheimer's disease; Computational modeling; fMRI

Introduction

Individuals with Alzheimer's disease (AD) often show impaired decision-making capacity, which is associated with reduced autonomy in activities of daily living, diminished ability to make informed health-related decisions, increased financial exploitation, and heightened caregiver burden.[1-3] Effort-based decision making is the process by which individuals evaluate whether a reward's value justifies the effort required to obtain it.[4,5] Compared to younger adults, cognitively unimpaired older adults tend to avoid high-effort options and show heightened sensitivity to cognitive and physical effort costs.[6,7] Individuals with mild cognitive impairment (MCI) and probable AD with elevated apathy demonstrate reduced sensitivity to effort costs characterized by a bias toward rejecting effortful options, potentially due to declines in executive functioning.[4,5] Disruptions in effort-based decision making may hinder engagement in modifiable behaviors that protect physical and cognitive health, including physical activity and social and cognitive engagement.[8-10]

Despite these age-related changes in effort-based decision making, aging is also characterized by shifts in social motivational priorities. Socioemotional Selectivity Theory posits that as perceived time horizons shrink with age, individuals increasingly prioritize emotionally meaningful social goals over information acquisition.[11,12] Consistent with this framework, older adults show enhanced positive affect and a greater focus on maintaining close social relationships relative to younger adults.[13-16] Moreover, decision-making abilities are often preserved in emotionally salient and interpersonal contexts in older adulthood.[17,18] Compared to younger adults, older adults also engage in more prosocial behaviors, such as volunteering and charitable giving, and display a greater willingness to expend effort that benefits others.[9,19-21] Enhanced prosocial behavior is particularly relevant in preclinical AD, as socioemotional processes appear preserved or even enhanced in early disease stages.[22] Moreover, prosocial behavior in later life is associated with greater purpose in life, improved physical and cognitive health, and reduced loneliness and depression.[23-25]

At the neural level, prosocial behavior consistently implicates the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) and the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC). The vmPFC integrates reward value and effort costs to compute subjective value, particularly in socioemotional contexts.[26-28] In

younger adults, increased vmPFC activity during a compassion exercise predicted subsequent reductions in sedentary behavior, highlighting its role at the intersection of interpersonal experience and physical effort.[29] VmPFC activity has also been shown to predict decisions to purchase social products that benefit others rather than commercial products.[30] Moreover, individuals with vmPFC lesions or atrophy, including those with frontotemporal dementia, exhibit reduced generosity, trust, and empathy, and discount rewards by effort more steeply when rewards benefit others.[31-34] In addition to the vmPFC, neurophysiological recordings in non-human primates show that ACC neurons selectively encode rewards allocated to others and track others' identities in social contexts.[35,36] Lesions to the ACC reduce prosocial learning and behavior in both animals and humans,[33,37] and human fMRI studies show heightened ACC activity when individuals exert effort to obtain rewards for others rather than themselves.[38,39] Together, these findings suggest that the vmPFC and ACC are core components of the neural architecture supporting prosocial effort-based decision making.

The apolipoprotein E ε4 (*APOE4*) allele is the strongest known genetic risk factor for late-onset AD.[40,41] *APOE4* carrier status has been associated with age-related cognitive decline, including impairments in executive function and goal-directed behavior.[42-44] Notably, *APOE4* carriers relative to non-carriers often show heightened cognitive reserve and a reduced risk of future cognitive decline from engaging in effortful healthy lifestyle behaviors, including physical activity and social engagement.[45-49] At the neural level, the *APOE4* allele contributes to neural vulnerability through mechanisms such as neuroinflammation, hyperexcitability, impaired lipid regulation, mitochondrial dysfunction, and amyloid dysregulation, which may disrupt neural circuits supporting motivated behavior.[50]

The dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC) and vmPFC are key cortical nodes within frontostriatal reward circuits that integrate motivational, cognitive, and motor processes during decision making.[51,52] These regions receive dopaminergic input from the ventral tegmental area (VTA) and nucleus accumbens (NAcc) and project to prefrontal regions to guide effortful behavior.[52] Animal models demonstrate that ACC lesions or ACC–NAcc disconnections reduce willingness to exert effort,[53,54] whereas human neuromodulation studies show that dACC stimulation evokes strong perseverance to overcome challenges.[55,56] In aging, preserved dACC structure and connectivity are associated with exceptional perseverance and tenacity to achieve

goals seen in "superagers".[57] However, cognitively unimpaired *APOE4* carriers exhibit early structural and functional alterations to regions within the reward network, including structural vulnerability of the VTA, elevated amyloid and tau deposition in the ACC and vmPFC, and reduced functional connectivity, cortical thickness, cerebral blood flow, and glucose metabolism of the NAcc, ACC, and vmPFC,[58-64] potentially impacting frontostriatal reward circuits supporting effort-based decision making. Resting-state fMRI provides an ideal approach for this question because it captures intrinsic functional organization of brain networks and is sensitive at detecting early brain changes associated with AD pathology prior to structural atrophy.[65,66]

The primary aim of the present study was to compare effort-based decision making for prosocial versus self-oriented rewards in older adults at risk for AD and to identify neural substrates associated with prosocial effort-based decision making. We hypothesized that, across participants, at-risk older adults would exert greater motivation (i.e., higher acceptance of effort, lower response times, higher vigor, higher reward sensitivity, and lower bias away from effort) for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards, and that prosocial effort-based decision making would be associated with greater resting-state functional connectivity (rsFC) to the vmPFC and ACC, regions implicated in social and motivational valuation. Given evidence that the *APOE4* allele is associated with alterations in regions of the frontostriatal reward network and reduced goal-directed behavior, it was further hypothesized that *APOE4* carriers would show overall impairments in effort-based decision making and altered rsFC between key reward regions, including the VTA, NAcc, dACC, and vmPFC, relative to non-carriers. Exploratory analyses additionally examined whether *APOE4* status differentially modulated prosocial versus self-oriented effort-based decision making.

Materials and methods

Participants

Participants were 52 older adults from the Presymptomatic Evaluation of Experimental or Novel Treatments for Alzheimer's Disease (PREVENT-AD) cohort at McGill University.[67] The sample size was calculated based on a paired *t*-test model with a two-tailed alpha of $p < .05$, a moderate effect size of Cohen's $d = 0.4$, and 80% power to detect significant differences in effort-based decision making between conditions as well as a linear regression model with a two-tailed alpha of $p < .05$, a moderate effect size of Cohen's $f^2 = 0.16$ and 80% power to detect significant brain-behavior associations. All participants were cognitively unimpaired at enrollment, aged 55 years or older, and had a first-degree family history of AD. Participants were enrolled in an optional sub-study, a randomized controlled trial aimed at increasing physical activity. The data analyzed in the present study were collected at baseline, prior to intervention onset. Details of the intervention and eligibility criteria have been reported previously.[68]

Materials

The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status

A scale used for assessing subjectively perceived socioeconomic status (SES).[69] The scale presents a picture of a ladder with 10 rungs and participants are told to "imagine that the ladder represents where people stand in society." The top rung (10) represents people who are the "best off" while the bottom rung (1) represents people who are the "worst off". Participants are asked to select a number between 1 and 10 that best represents the rung where they think they stand in relation to others in society.

Patient Health Questionnaire-9

A questionnaire that consists of 9 items used for assessing symptoms of depression.[70] Items ask how often over the past two weeks the respondent has been bothered by problems, such as "little interest or pleasure in doing things" and "feeling down, depressed, or hopeless". Each item is scored from 0 to 3, with 0 = Not at all and 3 = Nearly every day. Scores range from 0 to 27, with higher scores indicating more severe symptoms of depression.

Repeatable Battery for the Assessment of Neuropsychological Status

Cognitive functioning was assessed using the Repeatable Battery for the Assessment of Neuropsychological Status,[71] a standardized neuropsychological battery that evaluates five domains: Immediate Memory, Visuospatial/Constructional Ability, Language, Attention, and Delayed Memory. Domain and total index scores are age-normed standardized scores with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15, with higher scores indicating better cognitive performance.

Effort-Based Decision-Making Task

Effort-based decision making was assessed using a task consisting of 120 trials in which participants decided whether to exert physical effort for monetary rewards.[72] On each trial, participants were presented with a reward amount ($0.50–$3.00), reward type (prosocial or self-oriented), and required effort level. In the self-oriented condition, participants decided whether to exert effort to earn money for themselves, while in the prosocial condition, they decided whether to exert effort to donate money to a charity of their choosing. On each trial, participants were presented with a reward and the amount of effort required to obtain that reward, represented by the height of a red bar corresponding to one of five effort levels (3, 20, 37, 54, or 70 key presses). Participants indicated whether they accepted or rejected the offer by pressing ‘Y’ or ‘N’ on their keyboard. On one third of accepted trials, participants completed the required effort by alternating between the left and right arrow keys on their keyboard to raise the red bar to the height of a blue arrow. Participants were informed that one successfully completed trial would be randomly selected for payout.



Figure 1 The effort-based decision-making task. The task consists of a prosocial (panel A) and self-oriented (panel B) reward condition. On each trial, participants accept or reject completing a certain amount of physical effort with a Y/N keyboard press. The amount of effort is represented by a red line at different heights, with a higher line requiring a greater amount of button presses. Prosocial or self-oriented monetary rewards vary between $0.50 - $3.00 on each trial. Thirty percent of trials are followed by work trials (Panel C) where participants must alternate between the left and right arrow keys to gradually move the red line up to the height of the blue arrow.

Procedure

Multi-echo resting-state functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) data were collected between 2021 and 2022, and behavioral data were collected between 2021 and 2024. Participants were recruited from the PREVENT-AD cohort via phone, email, and mailed invitations. Eligible participants attended a videoconference session during which study procedures were explained and informed consent was obtained in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Participants completed an online questionnaire battery administered via REDCap, followed by the effort-based decision making task.

APOE Genotyping

All participants were genotyped for APOE through a blood draw. DNA was isolated from 200 μl of the blood sample using the QIASymphony apparatus and the DNA Blood Mini QIA kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA, USA). APOE gene variant was determined using pyrosequencing with PyroMark Q96 (Qiagen, Toronto, ON, Canada). *APOE4* carriership was defined as the presence of at least one ε4 allele.

FMRI Acquisition and Preprocessing

Participants were scanned on a 3T Siemens Magnetom Prisma MRI scanner with a 32-channel head coil (Siemens Medical Solutions, Erlangen, Germany). T1-weighted structural images were acquired using an MPRAGE sequence (1 mm isotropic voxels; TR = 2300 ms; TE = 2.96 ms; TI = 900 ms; flip angle = 9°; FOV = 256 mm; phase encode A-P; GRAPPA factor = 2; BW = 625 Hz/px). Resting-state fMRI data were acquired using a multi-echo echo-planar imaging (EPI) sequence during a single 10 min 24 s eyes-closed run (3 mm isotropic voxels; TR

= 1000 ms; TE1 = 12 ms, TE2 = 30.11 ms, TE3 = 48.22 ms; flip angle = 50°; FOV = 240 mm; phase encode A-P; BW = 2500 Hz/px; GRAPPA ×2 acceleration; 48 slices).

Anatomical and functional MRI data were preprocessed using fMRIPrep v22.1.1.[73] Susceptibility-induced distortions were estimated from a B0 fieldmap generated from paired EPI reference images and corrected using topup (FSL 6.0.5.1).[74] Motion and distortion parameters were estimated from the first echo, and all echoes were resampled in native space. The first four volumes of each echo were removed to mitigate non–steady-state effects using fslroi. Multi-echo denoising was performed on minimally preprocessed scanner-space data using tedana's TE-dependence analysis pipeline, which estimates voxelwise T2* to optimally combine echoes and separate BOLD from non-BOLD components following the Kundu decision tree.[75,76] Subsequent analyses used the optimally combined denoised time series. Functional images were coregistered to T1 images and normalized to MNI152NLin2009cAsym space using antsRegistration (ANTs v2.3.3), then spatially smoothed with a 4-mm FWHM Gaussian kernel in CONN.[77] Data quality was assessed using temporal signal-to-noise ratio, framewise displacement (>0.50 mm), and DVARS outliers (threshold = 20). Participants with >10% contaminated volumes were excluded, resulting in removal of three participants.

Statistical Analysis

Behavioral

A generalized linear mixed-effects model was used to examine the influence of condition, reward, effort, and their interactions on the yes/no decision to exert effort using the *glmer* function from the lme4 package in R. Decision (yes or no) was coded as a binary outcome variable, and condition (prosocial vs. self-oriented), reward amount, effort level, and their interactions were included as fixed effects. Age, sex, years of education, SES, *APOE4* status, MCI status, and depression were included as covariates of non-interest in all models.

Robust linear mixed-effects models were conducted to examine the influence of condition, reward, effort, and decision (yes or no) and their interactions (fixed effects) on decision response times (outcome) as well as the influence of condition (fixed effect) on response vigor (outcome). The r*lmer* function from the robustlmm package in R was used for the robust linear mixed-effects models. Vigor was defined as the number of button presses per

second on completed work trials. To examine differences between *APOE4* carriers and non-carriers in yes/no decisions, response times, and vigor, additional models were conducted with *APOE4* status included as an interaction term to the models. Subject-level random intercepts were included in all models. Post-hoc comparisons were performed using the emmeans package in R with a Bonferroni correction to adjust for multiple comparisons.

Computational Modelling

To characterize the maximum effort participants were willing to exert at each reward level, individual effort–reward curves were modeled using linear, sigmoid, and Weibull functions.[72] Models were fit separately for each participant and condition using variational Bayes model inversion implemented in the VBA toolbox (MATLAB R2023b).[78] Curve fitting was conducted within a mixed-effects framework to reduce the influence of outliers by iteratively estimating a Gaussian population-level prior from participant-level posterior estimates until convergence of group-level model evidence. Because both prosocial and self-oriented conditions contributed to the shared group prior, this procedure likely provided conservative estimates of condition differences by shrinking individual parameters toward the group mean.

The three functions used to map reward magnitude (x) onto maximum effort exerted (y) were:

1. Linear:

$$y = mx + c$$

where *m* is the slope and *c* is the intercept.

2. Sigmoid:

$$y = c \cdot \frac{1}{1 + exp\,(-(x - \square\square\square\square)/\sigma)}$$

where *bias* determines the horizontal shift of the curve (tendency to avoid effort at a given reward) and σ reflects reward sensitivity (change in effort per unit reward).

3. Weibull:

$$y = A(1 - 2^{-(x \cdot L)^S})$$

where *L* represents the minimum reward needed to initiate effort (latency), *S* controls how abruptly effort increases with reward (reward sensitivity), and *A* determines the maximum achievable effort.

Random-effects Bayesian model comparison was used to determine the best-fitting model based on protected exceedance probability. To confirm model equivalence across conditions, between-condition random-effects model comparison was conducted on the same model set. Parameter reliability was assessed using a simulation–recovery procedure with 1,000 parameter sets sampled from the group-level posterior distribution. Synthetic datasets were generated using these parameters and re-inverted using the same procedure, and recovered parameters were correlated with the original sampled values using product-moment correlations. Parameter estimates from the winning model were then extracted for each participant and condition. Linear mixed-effects models (lmer, lme4 package in R) tested condition effects on parameter estimates with subject-level random intercepts, and additional models examined condition × APOE4 interactions.

Resting-state fMRI

Resting-state fMRI analyses were conducted using the CONN toolbox (RRID:SCR_009550; release 22.v2407).[77] For model parameters showing significant condition differences, within-subject difference scores (e.g., $bias_{self\text{-}oriented} - bias_{prosocial}$) were computed to index greater prosocial relative to self-oriented effort-based decision making. Seed-to-voxel analyses examined associations between these difference scores and rsFC. Seeds included the vmPFC and ACC, selected *a priori* based on prior evidence implicating these regions in prosocial behavior. The vmPFC seed was defined using a meta-analytic mask of subjective value processing and the ACC seed using an anatomical mask previously associated with prosocial effort-based decision making.[26,39] Functional connectivity was estimated as Fisher-transformed correlations between seed and voxel BOLD time series using CONN's weighted general linear model. Cluster-level inference used a voxel threshold of $p < .001$ and cluster-level FDR correction of $p < .05$ based on Gaussian random field theory.

ROI-to-ROI analyses examined rsFC differences between APOE4 carriers and non-carriers within a predefined reward circuit comprising the VTA, NAcc, dACC, and vmPFC. Regions were defined using established atlases (VTA probabilistic atlas, Harvard–Oxford for bilateral NAcc, Desikan–Killiany for dACC, and meta-analytic vmPFC mask).[26,79-81] Functional connectivity was estimated using Fisher-transformed correlations within CONN's weighted-GLM framework. Group-level GLMs examined *APOE4* carrier status as the effect of interest

while controlling for the same covariates as seed-to-voxel analyses, with FDR correction applied across connections ($p < .05$). Significant connections were followed up with exploratory linear and robust regression analyses (lm and rlm in R) examining associations with effort-based decision-making outcomes.

Functional connectivity multivariate pattern analysis (fc-MVPA) was used to identify data-driven associations between effort-based decision making parameter difference scores and rsFC, as well as rsFC differences between *APOE4* carriers and non-carriers. Fc-MVPA estimated the first five eigenpatterns capturing principal axes of inter-individual variability in whole-brain functional connectivity. Eigenpatterns and subject-specific eigenpattern scores were derived using singular value decomposition of seed-to-voxel connectivity matrices. Group-level voxelwise GLMs were estimated on eigenpattern scores using the same inference framework and correction procedures as the seed-to-voxel analyses. Clusters exceeding $k > 50$ voxels were followed up with seed-to-voxel analyses using identical models as described above.

To assess robustness to potential outliers, significant effects were followed up using post-hoc robust regression analyses with M-estimation implemented in the *rlm* function from the MASS package in R (see Supplementary Materials). 95% confidence intervals for regression coefficients were obtained using nonparametric bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples using R's boot package.

Results

Participant Demographics

129 participants were screened for eligibility, with 61 excluded as a result of not meeting inclusion criteria and 16 deemed eligible who declined participating, resulting in a final sample of $N = 52$ included in final behavioral analyses. Three additional participants were excluded from neuroimaging analyses due to motion-related artifacts. Demographic, psychiatric, and cognitive information for the full sample, and for each *APOE* group, is shown in Table 1. There were no statistically significant differences between the *APOE* groups in any characteristics.

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the full sample (*M* ± *SD*).

	Total Sample (*N* = 52)	APOE4 carriers (*n* = 18)	APOE4 non-carriers (*n* = 34)
Age	68.48 ± 4.35	67.5 ± 5.48	69 ± 3.59
Sex	Female = 38 Male = 14	Female = 14 Male = 4	Female = 24 Male = 10
Socioeconomic status (MacArthur Scale of Perceived Social Status)	6.71 ± 1.49	6.72 ± 1.49	6.7 ± 1.51
Education (years)	16.04 ± 3.17	15.5 ± 4.18	16.32 ± 2.51
MCI status	CU = 41 MCI = 11	CU = 15 MCI = 3	CU = 26 MCI = 8
Depression (PHQ-9)	2.38 ± 2.53	2.56 ± 2.25	2.29 ± 2.69
RBANS Total	102.13 ± 8.34	102.5 ± 9.63	101.94 ± 7.72
RBANS Immediate memory	104.9 ± 10.13	108 ± 9.26	103.26 ± 10.31
RBANS Visuospatial/Constructional	85.58 ± 9.71	84.5 ± 12.06	86.15 ± 8.35
RBANS Language	98.29 ± 9.81	98.83 ± 12.21	98 ± 8.46
RBANS Attention	111.15 ± 15.56	110.89 ± 18.73	111.29 ± 13.9
RBANS Delayed memory	101.73 ± 7.75	102.89 ± 7.68	101.12 ± 7.83

Note. CU = cognitively unimpaired; MCI = mild cognitive impairment; RBANS = Repeatable Battery for the Assessment of Neuropsychological Status.

Behavioral

Results of the generalized linear mixed-effects model showed that participants accepted more prosocial than self-oriented reward trials (β = 0.682, *SE* = 0.313, *z* = 2.18, *p* = .029, *OR* = 1.98, 95% *CI* [1.07, 3.65]). A significant reward value × effort level interaction was observed across conditions (β = 0.01, *SE* = 0.002, *z* = 2.07, *p* = .039, *OR* = 1.01, 95% *CI* [1.00, 1.01]).

Post-hoc contrasts showed a decrease in effort acceptance for small increases in effort when rewards were low, while at higher reward values, only the highest effort level (70 presses) significantly reduced acceptance relative to lower effort levels (3 or 20 presses). Main effects indicated that higher effort significantly reduced effort acceptance (β = −0.038, *SE* = 0.01, *z* = −7.58, *p* < .001, *OR* = 0.96, 95% *CI* [0.95, 0.97]) and higher reward significantly increased effort acceptance (β = 1.10, *SE* = 0.123, *z* = 8.94, *p* < .001, *OR* = 3.01, 95% *CI* [2.37, 3.84]).

Robust linear mixed-effects models revealed significantly longer decision response times in the prosocial compared to the self-oriented condition (β = -0.54, *SE* = 0.21, *z* = -2.54, *p* = .011) and as the level of effort required decreased (β = -0.02, *SE* = 0.01, *z* = -2.30, *p* = .021). There was no effect of condition on response vigor (*p* > .05).



Figure 2 Effort acceptance and decision response times by condition. The probability of accepting effort is significantly higher for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards (Panel A) and effort acceptance is maintained with increasing effort with higher reward values (Panel B).

Decision response times were significantly higher in the prosocial compared to self-oriented reward condition (Panel C), *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Computational Modelling

Random-effects Bayesian model comparison indicated that the sigmoid function provided the best fit to reward-effort discounting curves (protected exceedance probability > 0.999 and estimated model frequency = 0.976). Bayesian model selection further showed no difference in model fit between the prosocial and self-oriented reward conditions (protected exceedance probability = 1.00 for model equivalence). The sigmoid model provided a good account of individual effort-reward functions across participants (mean R^2 = 0.883, *SD* = 0.185 for prosocial condition; mean R^2 = 0.896, *SD* = 0.153 for self-oriented condition). The correlations between simulated and recovered parameter estimates for N = 1000 randomly drawn samples were r = .627 for sigma and r = .692 for bias, indicating acceptable reliability.

Results of the linear mixed-effects models on sigmoid model parameters showed that bias away from effort was significantly higher in the self-oriented compared to prosocial condition (β = 5.98, *SE* = 2.13, t = 2.81, p = .007). There was no significant effect of condition on sigma/reward insensitivity (p > .05).



Figure 3 Results of modelling the reward-effort relationship. A sigmoid function represented a better overall fit to the reward-effort data than a linear or Weibull model (Panel A). Bias away from effort (right translation of the curve) was significantly higher in the self-oriented compared to prosocial reward condition while there were no differences between conditions in reward insensitivity/sigma (slope of the curve) (Panels B and C). $^{**}p < .01$

Behavioral Differences between *APOE4* Carriers and Non-Carriers

A significant condition × *APOE4* status interaction was observed for response vigor (β = -0.62, SE = 0.18, z = -3.46, $p < .001$). Post-hoc comparisons (Table S4) indicated higher vigor for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards in *APOE4* carriers, with no differences between conditions among non-carriers. *APOE4* carriers also exhibited greater vigor than non-carriers for prosocial, but not self-oriented, rewards. In addition, *APOE4* status was associated with greater bias away from effort expenditure across conditions, with carriers showing higher bias than non-carriers (β = 0.10, SE = 0.01, t = 2.15, p = .037).



Figure 4 Differences in effort-based decision making by *APOE4* carriership. Vigor was significantly higher for *APOE4* carriers than non-carriers when rewards were prosocial (Panel A) and bias away from effort expenditure was higher for *APOE4* carriers compared to non-carriers across both conditions (Panel B). $^{**}p < .01$, $^{*}p < .05$

Resting-State fMRI Results

Region of Interest Analyses

Bias difference scores (self-oriented − prosocial) were associated with enhanced rsFC between the vmPFC seed and the left dorsomedial PFC ($t(39) = 5.22$, peak MNI = [0, 38, 44], k = 86). Bias difference scores were also associated with enhanced rsFC between the ACC seed and two clusters in the left inferior frontal gyrus, pars triangularis (cluster 1: $t(39) = 6.32$, peak MNI = [−42, 26, 14], k = 149; cluster 2: $t(39) = 4.66$, peak MNI = [−54, 26, 20], k = 47). In contrast, bias difference scores were associated with reduced rsFC between the ACC seed and the right superior lateral occipital cortex ($t(39) = -6.07$, peak MNI = [30, −78, 44], k = 108), right superior parietal lobule ($t(39) = -4.69$, peak MNI = [30, −52, 60], k = 51), right anterior middle/inferior temporal gyrus ($t(39) = -6.43$, peak MNI = [60, −8, 8], k = 50), and right dorsolateral PFC ($t(39) = -6.04$, peak MNI = [24, 12, 42], k = 48).



Figure 5 Seed-to-voxel resting-state functional connectivity associated with bias towards prosocial effort. Higher bias towards effort expenditure for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards was associated with enhanced rsFC between the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and left dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (panel A) and the gyrus of the anterior cingulate cortex (panel B) with the left inferior frontal gyrus (positive rsFC) and right superior lateral occipital cortex, right

superior parietal lobule, right anterior middle/inferior temporal gyrus, and right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (anticorrelated rsFC). Results are overlaid on a standard MNI template and corrected for multiple comparisons.

The ROI-to-ROI analyses revealed that *APOE4* carriers, relative to non-carriers, had reduced rsFC between the right NAcc and dACC ($t(40) = -3.55$, p-FDR = .01). Moreover, lower right NAcc-dACC rsFC was positively associated with bias away from effort expenditure across both conditions, $\beta = -0.257$, $SE = 0.11$, $t(40) = -2.32$, $p = .025$.

Multivariate Pattern Analyses

Fc-MVPA revealed that bias difference scores (self-oriented - prosocial) were associated with three vmPFC clusters across all participants: a posterior vmPFC/subcallosal cluster spanning both hemispheres (labelled 1 in Fig. 6A; $F(5,35) = 9.09$, peak MNI = [0, 4, 28], k = 676), an anterior vmPFC cluster extending into the bilateral medial frontal poles (labelled 3 in Fig. 7A; $F(5,35) = 5.05$, peak MNI = [2, 56, −28], k = 298), and a right posterior vmPFC cluster (labelled 2 in Fig. 6A; $F(5,35) = 8.05$, peak MNI = [18, 50, 10], k = 96).

Post-hoc seed-to-voxel analyses using these clusters as seeds showed that bias difference scores were associated with enhanced rsFC between the posterior vmPFC/subcallosal seed (seed 1 in Fig. 7A) and the right dorsolateral PFC ($t(39) = 5.78$, peak MNI = [28, 44, 36], k = 61), and reduced rsFC with the right lateral occipital cortex ($t(39) = -7.02$, peak MNI = [52, −72, 8], k = 268). Bias difference scores were also associated with enhanced rsFC between the anterior vmPFC/frontal pole seed (seed 3 in Fig. 7A) and the right temporal pole ($t(39) = 6.64$, peak MNI = [32, 4, 26], k = 199), left temporal pole ($t(39) = 5.02$, peak MNI = [−46, 20, −34], k = 95), and right frontal pole ($t(39) = 4.96$, peak MNI = [12, 56, 14], k = 55), as well as reduced rsFC with the left lateral occipital cortex/superior parietal lobule ($t(39) = -6.14$, peak MNI = [−36, −52, 54], k = 93), left postcentral gyrus ($t(39) = -6.61$, peak MNI = [−50, −16, 50], k = 65), and left temporoparietal junction ($t(39) = -5.64$, peak MNI = [−54, −40, 54], k = 54). Fc-MVPA did not

identify any significant clusters differentiating *APOE4* carriers from non-carriers.



Figure 6 Whole-brain functional connectivity multivariate pattern analyses associated with bias towards prosocial effort. Panel A shows three seeds located in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex. Panel B shows resting-state functional connectivity between vmPFC seed 3 with the bilateral temporal poles and right frontal pole (positive connectivity) and with the left lateral occipital cortex / superior parietal lobule, left postcentral gyrus, and left temporoparietal junction (negative connectivity). Panel C shows resting-state functional connectivity between vmPFC seed 1 with the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (positive connectivity) and right lateral occipital cortex (negative connectivity). No significant effects were found with seed 2.

Discussion

This study examined effort-based decision making for prosocial versus self-oriented rewards and the rsFC underlying prosocial effort-based decision making in older adults at risk for AD. Given evidence for heightened social motivation in aging and relatively preserved socioemotional functioning in early AD, we tested whether prosocial incentives enhance effort-based decision making and whether these processes are altered in carriers of the *APOE4* allele, a genetic risk factor for AD.[9,12,22,50] Participants showed greater acceptance of effort for prosocial than self-oriented rewards and took longer to reach a decision threshold for prosocial rewards. Greater bias toward prosocial effort was associated with enhanced vmPFC–dmPFC and ACC–left inferior frontal gyrus rsFC, and reduced ACC connectivity with lateral occipital cortex, superior parietal lobule, inferior/middle temporal gyrus, and dlPFC. Compared with non-carriers,

APOE4 carriers showed reduced dACC–NAcc connectivity, which was associated with greater bias away from effort across conditions.

Older adults showed greater acceptance and bias towards prosocial compared to self-oriented effort, consistent with evidence that aging is associated with heightened prosocial behavior and social motivation.[9,12,19] These findings partially align with prior work showing reduced effort discounting for prosocial rewards in older relative to younger adults, though previous within-group comparisons in older adults reported lower acceptance of effort for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards.[9] Such discrepancies may reflect methodological differences, including the type and frequency of effort and the subjective value of the reward. In the present study, effort involved keyboard presses completed on one third of accepted trials, whereas prior work required squeezing a dynamometer on all accepted trials, potentially making effort in the current task less costly or more uncertain. Additionally, rewards were charitable donations, which may be more meaningful to older adults than abstract points or credits. This interpretation is consistent with evidence that prosocial behavior in aging increases when effort costs are lower and outcomes align with emotionally meaningful goals.[82]

Consistent with prior work, vigor across the whole sample did not differ between prosocial and self-oriented conditions.[9] This suggests that at-risk older adults exert as much effort to obtain a prosocial reward compared to a reward for themselves and that prosocial incentives primarily enhance the decision to exert effort rather than the magnitude of effort exerted once a decision has been made. Similarly, the slope of the effort–reward sigmoid function did not differ between prosocial and self-oriented conditions. This suggests that older adults' decisions were equally sensitive to increases in reward size regardless of who benefited. However, the monetary amounts used in this task were small ($0.50–$3.00), which may have limited the extent to which reward-size differences between conditions influenced acceptance of effort expenditure. Future studies should therefore examine these processes in more ecologically valid contexts to determine whether the stability of reward sensitivity observed here generalizes to real-world decisions.

Contrary to our expectations, older adults took longer to reach a decision threshold for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards. Longer response times may reflect increased deliberative processing during decision making.[83-85] Thus, one possibility is that prosocial effort

is perceived as more cognitively demanding because the benefits are less immediate and self-directed, requiring greater integration of value, effort, and social cognitive processing. Prosocial decisions may therefore recruit additional deliberative processes such as inhibitory control, value integration, and mentalizing.[83,86] Future work should directly test this interpretation by manipulating cognitive load, temporal delay, or mentalizing demands during prosocial versus self-oriented effort-based decision-making to determine how these processes influence effort-based decisions.

Beyond condition differences, effort acceptance generally declined as effort demands increased and reward magnitude decreased, consistent with effort discounting. However, at higher levels of reward magnitude, effort acceptance remained increasingly more stable across effort levels, suggesting that sufficiently large incentives can help override increases in effort costs for both reward types. These findings have important practical implications, indicating that effort sensitivity in older adults at risk for AD is modifiable. Small rewards may be insufficient for motivating effort when tasks become too demanding and increases in effort without commensurate increases in reward may contribute to behavioral disengagement. Strategically deploying larger or more salient incentives during high-effort periods, such as at the initiation of a behavior change program, may provide a means to help sustain engagement.

At the neural level, both seed-to-voxel and fc-MVPA analyses converged on the vmPFC, a node of the reward and default mode networks, as a key hub underlying individual differences in bias towards prosocial relative to self-oriented effort. Meta-analytic work suggests a rostrocaudal organization of vmPFC, with posterior regions integrating affective and motivational relevance and anterior regions supporting valuation, social cognition, and action selection.[87] Bias towards prosocial effort was associated with stronger rsFC between the vmPFC seed implicated in valuation[26] and dmPFC, a core node of the default mode network involved in perspective taking, mentalizing, and self-referential processing.[88,89] Prior work demonstrates vmPFC–dmPFC co-activation during social decision making, with dmPFC activity scaling with cognitive and physical effort devoted to valued goals.[88,90] Enhanced vmPFC–dmPFC coupling may therefore reflect more effective integration of valuation and social-cognitive representations, a hypothesis to be tested in future work.

Higher bias toward prosocial effort was associated with increased rsFC between vmPFC clusters identified by fc-MVPA and the right dlPFC and bilateral temporal poles. The dlPFC, a hub of the frontoparietal control network involved in planning and goal-directed behavior,[91,92] has been linked to goal simulation, generativity, and prioritizing options that benefit others over the self when co-active with the vmPFC.[25,93,94] Moreover, the vmPFC and temporal poles form part of a limbic subsystem of the default mode network supporting empathy, moral reasoning, and valuation of others' outcomes.[95-97] In contrast, greater bias towards prosocial effort was associated with anticorrelated rsFC between vmPFC clusters and regions of perceptual and attention networks, including the lateral occipital cortex, superior parietal lobule, postcentral gyrus, and left temporoparietal junction.[87,98-101] Anticorrelation between default mode and perceptual–attentional networks is often reduced in aging and AD and its preservation is linked to better cognition.[102,103] This pattern may reflect a shift away from externally driven processing toward internally guided valuation and socioemotional representations during prosocial decision making. This interpretation aligns with evidence that aging is associated with a shift from exploratory to exploitative decision strategies that prioritize emotionally meaningful goals.[104]

Bias towards prosocial compared to self-oriented effort was also associated with rsFC to the ACC, a region central to monitoring others' outcomes, encoding social value, and prosocial effort-based decision-making.[35,38] Stronger rsFC between ACC and left IFG and reduced rsFC between the ACC with regions of the frontoparietal and attentional-perceptual networks (e.g., lateral occipital cortex, superior parietal lobule, inferior/middle temporal gyrus, dlPFC) was associated with higher bias towards prosocial effort. Parts of the left IFG have been hypothesized to include mirror neurons crucial for the social perception of emotions.[105,106] The IFG has been shown to co-activate with the ACC during semantic processing, emotion regulation, and cognitive control,[107,108] processes crucial for social behavior. Reduced coupling between ACC and regions of attentional-perceptual/frontoparietal networks may indicate that prosocial effort decisions rely less on deliberative control and external action planning than self-oriented decisions, aligning with evidence that ACC–frontoparietal connectivity increases during cognitively demanding tasks but decreases at rest when motivational priorities guide action selection.[109]

Comparisons between *APOE4* carriers and non-carriers revealed that carriers showed a greater overall bias away from exerting effort across reward types yet exhibited heightened vigor once engaging in effort for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards. This suggests *APOE4* carriers accept smaller amounts of effort for a given reward value than non-carriers but display enhanced energization to obtain prosocial rewards after they have been accepted. One possible explanation that warrants future investigation is altered dopaminergic function in *APOE4* carriers, such as diminished tonic signalling supporting baseline motivation alongside relatively intact or enhanced phasic responses to salient, prosocial rewards that invigorate action.[110-113] Consistent with this account, one animal study reported lower dopamine levels in the frontal cortex of *APOE4* mice compared to *APOE2* and *APOE3* mice.[114] In addition, some studies suggest that vigor is supported by dopaminergic signalling in the nigrostriatal pathway comprising the substantia nigra and dorsal striatum.[115,116] Thus, future studies should examine how *APOE4* carriership might affect rsFC of this circuit and its relationship with vigor.

APOE4 carriers showed reduced rsFC between the dACC and right NAcc, with reduced rsFC associated with greater bias away from effort expenditure. Converging evidence from animal and human studies indicate that the dACC-NAcc circuit plays a critical role in integrating effort costs and reward valuation during motivated behavior, supporting choices toward high effort options and reducing reward thresholds required to engage in effort.[91,117] Thus, disruptions in this circuit in *APOE4* carriers may impact how reward and effort are integrated to drive goal-directed behavior. Moreover, the present results were observed despite no group differences in global cognition and after controlling for MCI status, suggesting that subtle alterations in effort-based decision-making and reward circuits may precede overt cognitive impairment in *APOE4* carriers at a heightened risk for AD.

Despite the insights gained from this study, several limitations warrant consideration. First, the sample was primarily composed of female, Caucasian, highly educated older adults from Quebec, Canada with a family history of AD who were recruited from a longitudinal AD prevention cohort. As such, participants may have been especially research-engaged and socially motivated, which may limit generalizability to broader and more diverse older adult populations. Second, the within-subjects design may have increased social desirability or subject-expectancy effects. Because only older adults were included, it also remains unclear how these findings

compare with younger adults, and direct age-group comparisons are needed to clarify lifespan changes in prosocial effort-based decision-making. Third, rewards were monetary, whereas many real-world prosocial behaviors are intrinsically rather than financially rewarding. Future work should therefore examine whether similar behavioral and neural patterns emerge for non-monetary prosocial acts. Finally, future studies should examine neuropathological mechanisms underlying APOE4-related differences in effort-based decision making, including potential contributions of inflammatory, amyloid, and neurotrophic markers.[118-120]

In summary, this study provides evidence that older adults at risk for AD accept more decisions to exert effort for prosocial than self-oriented rewards, with this preference associated with rsFC involving the vmPFC and ACC. Reduced rsFC within a reward circuit (dACC–NAcc) among APOE4 carriers suggests that this genetic risk may contribute to subtle alterations in motivation prior to cognitive decline. From a translational perspective, prosocial incentives may help maintain or enhance willingness to expend effort in at-risk older adults. Although APOE4 carriers accepted lower levels of effort overall, they showed greater vigor for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards, suggesting that prosocial incentives may be particularly effective at energizing action in this population. Because prosocial behaviors such as volunteering, caregiving, and charitable giving are associated with improved well-being, social connectedness, and reduced dementia risk,[12,121,122] leveraging prosocial rewards may represent a promising strategy to support goal-directed behavior and brain health in aging.

Data availability

All data and materials can be made available upon request.

Acknowledgements

We thank all the participants of the PREVENT-AD cohort for their time and effort. We also thank all students and research assistants who assisted with data collection. We would like to thank Claire Webster and Dr. Jessica Cooper for their valuable input on the project. We would also like to thank Margie Lachman for her leadership of the Boston Roybal Centre and Annie Le Bire and Joanna Masterlick for administrative support. We thank all the collaborators, consultants, and staff members from the PREVENT-AD Research Group. A complete list of the PREVENT-AD Research Group can be found at: https://preventad.loris.ca/acknowledgements/acknowledgements.php?date=.

Funding

This research was undertaken thanks in part to funding from a National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Discovery Grant (DGECR-2022-00299), an NSERC Early Career Researcher Supplement (RGPIN-2022-04496), a Fonds de Recherche Santé Québec (FRQS) Salary Award, the Canada Brain Research Fund (CBRF), an innovative arrangement between the Government of Canada (through Health Canada) and Brain Canada Foundation, an Alzheimer Society Research Program (ASRP) New Investigator Grant, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), the Canada First Research Excellence Fund, awarded through the Healthy Brains, Healthy Lives initiative at McGill University, and the National Institutes of Health (P30 AG048785) to MRG. This research was also undertaken thanks in part to funding from the CIHR Doctoral Research Award: Canada Graduate Scholarship (199381) to CSW.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

1. Davis R, Ziomkowski MK, Veltkamp A. Everyday Decision Making in Individuals with Early-Stage Alzheimer's Disease: An Integrative Review of the Literature. *Res Gerontol Nurs*. 2017;10(5):240-247.

2. Mattos MK, Gibson JS, Wilson D, Jepson L, Ahn S, Williams IC. Shared decision-making in persons living with dementia: A scoping review. *Dementia (London)*. 2023;22(4):875-909.

3. Sun W, Matsuoka T, Narumoto J. Decision-Making Support for People With Alzheimer's Disease: A Narrative Review. *Front Psychol*. 2021;12:750803.

4. Attaallah B, Toniolo S, Maio MR, Husain M. Apathy and effort-based decision-making in Alzheimer's disease and subjective cognitive impairment. *Alzheimers Dement (Amst)*. 2024;16(4):e70013.

5. Morris LA, Suzuki H, Lee S, Jin Z, Chen BB, Marin A, Huey ED, Gazes Y, Heilbronner SR, Le Heron, CJ, Vanegas-Arroyave N. Apathy, Effort-Based Decisions, and Brain Integrity in Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s Diseases. *Brain*. 2025, awaf393.

6. Byrne KA, Ghaiumy Anaraky R. Strive to Win or Not to Lose? Age-Related Differences in Framing Effects on Effort-Based Decision-Making. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2020;75(10):2095-2105.

7. Hess TM, Smith BT, Sharifian N. Aging and effort expenditure: The impact of subjective perceptions of task demands. *Psychol Aging*. 2016;31(7):653-660.

8. Crawford JL, English T, Braver TS. Cognitive Effort-Based Decision-Making Across Experimental and Daily Life Indices in Younger and Older Adults. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2023;78(1):40-50.

9. Lockwood PL, Abdurahman A, Gabay AS, et al. Aging Increases Prosocial Motivation for Effort. *Psychol Sci*. 2021;32(5):668-681.

10. Summerside EM, Courter RJ, Shadmehr R, Ahmed AA. Slowing of Movements in Healthy Aging as a Rational Economic Response to an Elevated Effort Landscape. *J Neurosci*. 2024;44(15):e1596232024.

11. Carstensen LL, Isaacowitz DM, Charles ST. Taking time seriously. A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Am Psychol*. 1999;54(3):165-181.

12. Isaacowitz DM, Freund AM, Mayr U, Rothermund K, Tobler PN. Age-Related Changes in the Role of Social Motivation: Implications for Healthy Aging. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2021;76(Suppl 2):S115-S124.

13. Livingstone KM, Isaacowitz DM. Age and emotion regulation in daily life: Frequency, strategies, tactics, and effectiveness. *Emotion*. 2021;21(1):39-51.

14. Luong G, Charles ST, Fingerman KL. Better With Age: Social Relationships Across Adulthood. *J Soc Pers Relat*. 2011;28(1):9-23.

15. Nikitin J, Luchetti M, Alimanovic N, Rupprecht FS, Sutin AR. Are social interactions perceived as more meaningful in older adulthood?. *Psychol Aging*. 2024;39(6):599-607.

16. Radjenovic S, Rupprecht FS, Nikitin J. Establishing and Maintaining Social Relationships During Significant Life Events: The Role of Age. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2024;79(11):gbae144.

17. Mikels JA, Taullahu DB. Emotion, Aging, and Decision Making: A State of the Art Mini-Review. *Adv Geriatr Med Res*. 2023;5(1):e230003.

18. Scheibe S, Carstensen LL. Emotional aging: recent findings and future trends. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2010;65B(2):135-144.

19. Cutler J, Nitschke JP, Lamm C, Lockwood PL. Older adults across the globe exhibit increased prosocial behavior but also greater in-group preferences. *Nat Aging*. 2021;1(10):880-888.

20. Li D, Cao Y, Hui BPH, Shum DHK. Are Older Adults More Prosocial Than Younger Adults? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Gerontologist*. 2024;64(9):gnae082.

21. Lin H, Lu YL, Li L, Li J, Zhang X, Fung HH. Selectivity in prosociality among older adults: The moderation effect of self- and other-oriented motivation. *Psychol Aging*. 2025;40(3):255-264.

22. Sturm, V. E., & Levenson, R. W. (2019). Neurobiology of positive emotion disruption in neurodegenerative disease. In J. Gruber (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of positive emotion and psychopathology* (pp. 465–481). Oxford University Press.

23. Byrne M, Tan RKJ, Wu D, et al. Prosocial Interventions and Health Outcomes: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(12):e2346789.

24. Chi K, Almeida DM, Charles ST, Sin NL. Daily prosocial activities and well-being: Age moderation in two national studies. *Psychol Aging*. 2021;36(1):83-95.

25. Walker CS, Li L, Baracchini G, et al. Neurobehavioral Mechanisms Influencing the Association Between Generativity, the Desire to Promote Well-Being of Younger Generations, and Purpose in Life in Older Adults at Risk for Alzheimer's Disease. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2024;79(6):gbae060.

26. Bartra O, McGuire JT, Kable JW. The valuation system: a coordinate-based meta-analysis of BOLD fMRI experiments examining neural correlates of subjective value. *Neuroimage*. 2013;76:412-427.

27. Moretti L, Dragone D, di Pellegrino G. Reward and social valuation deficits following ventromedial prefrontal damage. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2009;21(1):128-140.

28. Winecoff A, Clithero JA, Carter RM, Bergman SR, Wang L, Huettel SA. Ventromedial prefrontal cortex encodes emotional value. *J Neurosci*. 2013;33(27):11032-11039.

29. Kang Y, Cooper N, Pandey P, et al. Effects of self-transcendence on neural responses to persuasive messages and health behavior change. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2018;115(40):9974-9979.

30. Jung D, Sul S, Lee M, Kim H. Social Observation Increases Functional Segregation between MPFC Subregions Predicting Prosocial Consumer Decisions. *Sci Rep*. 2018;8(1):3368. Published 2018 Feb 20.

31. van den Bos W, Güroglu B. The role of the ventral medial prefrontal cortex in social decision making. *J Neurosci*. 2009;29(24):7631-7632.

32. Dilcher R, Malpas CB, O'Brien TJ, Vivash L. Social Cognition in Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia and Pathological Subtypes: A Narrative Review. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2023;94(1):19-38.

33. Gueguen M, Cutler J, Drew D, et al. Ventromedial prefrontal cortex lesions disrupt learning to reward others. *Brain*. 2025;148(10):3537-3550.

34. Lockwood PL, Cutler J, Drew D, et al. Human ventromedial prefrontal cortex is necessary for prosocial motivation. *Nat Hum Behav*. 2024;8(7):1403-1416.

35. Chang SW, Gariépy JF, Platt ML. Neuronal reference frames for social decisions in primate frontal cortex. *Nat Neurosci*. 2013;16(2):243-250.

36. Simon Iv J, Rich EL. Neural populations in macaque anterior cingulate cortex encode social image identities. *Nat Commun*. 2024;15(1):7500.

37. Basile BM, Schafroth JL, Karaskiewicz CL, Chang SWC, Murray EA. The anterior cingulate cortex is necessary for forming prosocial preferences from vicarious reinforcement in monkeys. *PLoS Biol*. 2020;18(6):e3000677. Published 2020 Jun 12. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000677

38. Lockwood PL, Apps MA, Roiser JP, Viding E. Encoding of Vicarious Reward Prediction in Anterior Cingulate Cortex and Relationship with Trait Empathy. *J Neurosci*. 2015;35(40):13720-13727.

39. Lockwood PL, Wittmann MK, Nili H, et al. Distinct neural representations for prosocial and self-benefiting effort. *Curr Biol*. 2022;32(19):4172-4185.e7.

40. Gharbi-Meliani A, Dugravot A, Sabia S, et al. The association of APOE ε4 with cognitive function over the adult life course and incidence of dementia: 20 years follow-up of the Whitehall II study. *Alzheimers Res Ther*. 2021;13(1):5.

41. Saddiki H, Fayosse A, Cognat E, et al. Age and the association between apolipoprotein E genotype and Alzheimer disease: A cerebrospinal fluid biomarker-based case-control study. *PLoS Med*. 2020;17(8):e1003289.

42. O'Donoghue MC, Murphy SE, Zamboni G, Nobre AC, Mackay CE. APOE genotype and cognition in healthy individuals at risk of Alzheimer's disease: A review. *Cortex*. 2018;104:103-123.

43. Panza F, Frisardi V, Seripa D, et al. Apolipoprotein E genotypes and neuropsychiatric symptoms and syndromes in late-onset Alzheimer's disease. *Ageing Res Rev*. 2012;11(1):87-103.

44. Zimmermann J, Alain C, Butler C. Impaired memory-guided attention in asymptomatic APOE4 carriers. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):8138.

45. Deeny SP, Poeppel D, Zimmerman JB, et al. Exercise, APOE, and working memory: MEG and behavioral evidence for benefit of exercise in epsilon4 carriers. *Biol Psychol*. 2008;78(2):179-187.

46. Niti M, Yap KB, Kua EH, Tan CH, Ng TP. Physical, social and productive leisure activities, cognitive decline and interaction with APOE-epsilon 4 genotype in Chinese older adults. *Int Psychogeriatr*. 2008;20(2):237-251.

47. O'Shea DM, Zhang AS, Rader K, Shakour RL, Besser L, Galvin JE. APOE ε4 carrier status moderates the effect of lifestyle factors on cognitive reserve. *Alzheimers Dement*. 2024;20(11):8062-8073.

48. Schuit AJ, Feskens EJ, Launer LJ, Kromhout D. Physical activity and cognitive decline, the role of the apolipoprotein e4 allele. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2001;33(5):772-777.

49. Zhang Y, Fu S, Ding D, Lutz MW, Zeng Y, Yao Y. Leisure Activities, *APOE* ε4, and Cognitive Decline: A Longitudinal Cohort Study. *Front Aging Neurosci*. 2021;13:736201.

50. Raulin AC, Doss SV, Trottier ZA, Ikezu TC, Bu G, Liu CC. ApoE in Alzheimer's disease: pathophysiology and therapeutic strategies. *Mol Neurodegener*. 2022;17(1):72.

51. Boorman ED, Rushworth MF, Behrens TE. Ventromedial prefrontal and anterior cingulate cortex adopt choice and default reference frames during sequential multi-alternative choice. *J Neurosci*. 2013;33(6):2242-2253.

52. Husain M, Roiser JP. Neuroscience of apathy and anhedonia: a transdiagnostic approach. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2018;19(8):470-484.

53. Hart EE, Gerson JO, Zoken Y, Garcia M, Izquierdo A. Anterior cingulate cortex supports effort allocation towards a qualitatively preferred option. *Eur J Neurosci*. 2017;46(1):1682-1688.

54. Hauber W, Sommer S. Prefrontostriatal circuitry regulates effort-related decision making. *Cereb Cortex*. 2009;19(10):2240-2247.

55. Caruana F, Gerbella M, Avanzini P, et al. Motor and emotional behaviours elicited by electrical stimulation of the human cingulate cortex. *Brain*. 2018;141(10):3035-3051.

56. Parvizi J, Rangarajan V, Shirer WR, Desai N, Greicius MD. The will to persevere induced by electrical stimulation of the human cingulate gyrus. *Neuron*. 2013;80(6):1359-1367.

57. Touroutoglou A, Andreano J, Dickerson BC, Barrett LF. The tenacious brain: How the anterior mid-cingulate contributes to achieving goals. *Cortex*. 2020;123:12-29.

58. Brown JA, Terashima KH, Burggren AC, et al. Brain network local interconnectivity loss in aging APOE-4 allele carriers. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011;108(51):20760-20765.

59. Contreras JA, Aslanyan V, Sweeney MD, et al. Functional connectivity among brain regions affected in Alzheimer's disease is associated with CSF TNF-α in APOE4 carriers. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2020;86:112-122.

60. Hays CC, Zlatar ZZ, Meloy MJ, et al. Anterior Cingulate Structure and Perfusion is Associated with Cerebrospinal Fluid Tau among Cognitively Normal Older Adult APOE□4 Carriers. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2020;73(1):87-101.

61. Hong YJ, Kim CM, Lee JH, Sepulcre J. Correlations between APOE4 allele and regional amyloid and tau burdens in cognitively normal older individuals. *Sci Rep*. 2022;12(1):14307.

62. Leclaire KN, Blujus JK, Korthauer LE, Driscoll I. APOE4-related differences in cortical thickness are modulated by sex in middle age. *Brain Imaging Behav*. 2024;18(5):1163-1171.

63. Therriault J, Benedet AL, Pascoal TA, et al. APOEε4 potentiates the relationship between amyloid-β and tau pathologies. *Mol Psychiatry*. 2021;26(10):5977-5988.

64. Wearn A, Tremblay SA, Tardif CL, et al. Neuromodulatory subcortical nucleus integrity is associated with white matter microstructure, tauopathy and APOE status. *Nat Commun*. 2024;15(1):4706.

65. Hrybouski S, Das SR, Xie L, et al. BOLD amplitude correlates of preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2025;150:157-171. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2025.03.007

66. Sheline YI, Raichle ME. Resting state functional connectivity in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2013;74(5):340-347.

67. Villeneuve S, Poirier J, Breitner JCS, et al. The PREVENT-AD cohort: accelerating Alzheimer's disease research and treatment in Canada and beyond. *Alzheimer's & Dementia*. 2025;21(10):e70653.

68. Walker CS, Noriega de la Colina AE, Li L, et al. Protocol for an intergenerational randomized controlled trial to enhance physical activity in older adults at risk for Alzheimer's disease. *J Prev Alzheimers Dis*. 2025;12(3):100039.

69. Adler NE, Epel ES, Castellazzo G, Ickovics JR. Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: preliminary data in healthy white women. *Health Psychol*. 2000;19(6):586-592.

70. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2001;16(9):606-613.

71. Randolph C, Tierney MC, Mohr E, Chase TN. The Repeatable Battery for the Assessment of Neuropsychological Status (RBANS): preliminary clinical validity. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 1998;20(3):310-319.

72. Morris LS, Norbury A, Smith DA, Harrison NA, Voon V, Murrough JW. Dissociating self-generated volition from externally-generated motivation. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(5):e0232949.

73. Esteban O, Markiewicz CJ, Blair RW, et al. fMRIPrep: a robust preprocessing pipeline for functional MRI. *Nat Methods*. 2019;16(1):111-116.

74. Smith SM, Jenkinson M, Woolrich MW, et al. Advances in functional and structural MR image analysis and implementation as FSL. *Neuroimage*. 2004;23 Suppl 1:S208-S219.

75. DuPre E, Salo T, Markello R, *et al.* TE-dependent analysis of multi-echo fMRI with tedana. J Open Source Softw. 2021;6(66):3669.

76. Kundu P, Inati SJ, Evans JW, Luh WM, Bandettini PA. Differentiating BOLD and non-BOLD signals in fMRI time series using multi-echo EPI. *Neuroimage*. 2012;60(3):1759-1770.

77. Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Nieto-Castanon A. Conn: a functional connectivity toolbox for correlated and anticorrelated brain networks. *Brain Connect*. 2012;2(3):125-141.

78. Daunizeau, V. Adam, L. Rigoux (2014), VBA: a probabilistic treatment of nonlinear models for neurobiological and behavioural data. *PLoS Comp Biol* 10(1): e1003441.

79. Desikan RS, Ségonne F, Fischl B, et al. An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *Neuroimage*. 2006;31(3):968-980.

80. Rushmore RJ, Bouix S, Kubicki M, Rathi Y, Yeterian E, Makris N. HOA2.0-ComPaRe: A next generation Harvard-Oxford Atlas comparative parcellation reasoning method for human and macaque individual brain parcellation and atlases of the cerebral cortex. *Front Neuroanat*. 2022;16:1035420.

81. Trutti AC, Fontanesi L, Mulder MJ, Bazin PL, Hommel B, Forstmann BU. A probabilistic atlas of the human ventral tegmental area (VTA) based on 7 Tesla MRI data. *Brain Struct Funct*. 2021;226(4):1155-1167.

82. Byrne KA, Lockwood PL, Ghaiumy Anaraky R, Liu Y. Age Differences in Prosocial Behavior Depend on Effort Costs. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2023;78(6):948-958.

83. Bowyer C, Brush CJ, Threadgill H, et al. The effort-doors task: Examining the temporal dynamics of effort-based reward processing using ERPs. *Neuroimage*. 2021;228:117656.

84. Sideridis G, Alahmadi MTS. The Role of Response Times on the Measurement of Mental Ability. *Front Psychol*. 2022;13:892317.

85. Zucchelli MM, Matteucci Armandi Avogli Trotti N, Pavan A, Piccardi L, Nori R. The Dual Process model: the effect of cognitive load on the ascription of intentionality. *Front Psychol*. 2025;16:1451590.

86. Pollerhoff L, Saulin A, Kurtz M, et al. Adult age differences in the integration of values for self and other. *Sci Rep*. 2025;15(1):12776.

87. Hiser J, Koenigs M. The Multifaceted Role of the Ventromedial Prefrontal Cortex in Emotion, Decision Making, Social Cognition, and Psychopathology. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2018;83(8):638-647.

88. Bzdok D, Langner R, Schilbach L, et al. Segregation of the human medial prefrontal cortex in social cognition. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2013;7:232.

89. Eickhoff SB, Laird AR, Fox PT, Bzdok D, Hensel L. Functional Segregation of the Human Dorsomedial Prefrontal Cortex. *Cereb Cortex*. 2016;26(1):304-321.

90. Clairis N, Pessiglione M. Value Estimation versus Effort Mobilization: A General Dissociation between Ventromedial and Dorsomedial Prefrontal Cortex. *J Neurosci*. 2024;44(17):e1176232024.

91. Botvinick M, An J. Goal-directed decision making in prefrontal cortex: A computational framework. *Adv Neural Inf Process Syst*. 2009;21:169-176.

92. Morris RW, Dezfouli A, Griffiths KR, Balleine BW. Action-value comparisons in the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex control choice between goal-directed actions. *Nat Commun*. 2014;5:4390.

93. Baumgartner T, Knoch D, Hotz P, Eisenegger C, Fehr E. Dorsolateral and ventromedial prefrontal cortex orchestrate normative choice. *Nat Neurosci*. 2011;14(11):1468-1474.

94. Gerlach KD, Spreng RN, Madore KP, Schacter DL. Future planning: default network activity couples with frontoparietal control network and reward-processing regions during process and outcome simulations. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci*. 2014;9(12):1942-1951.

95. Fan L, Wang J, Zhang Y, Han W, Yu C, Jiang T. Connectivity-based parcellation of the human temporal pole using diffusion tensor imaging. *Cereb Cortex*. 2014;24(12):3365-3378.

96. Girn M, Setton R, Turner GR, Spreng RN. The "limbic network," comprising orbitofrontal and anterior temporal cortex, is part of an extended default network: Evidence from multi-echo fMRI. *Netw Neurosci*. 2024;8(3):860-882.

97. Olson IR, Plotzker A, Ezzyat Y. The Enigmatic temporal pole: a review of findings on social and emotional processing. *Brain*. 2007;130(Pt 7):1718-1731.

98. Grill-Spector K, Kourtzi Z, Kanwisher N. The lateral occipital complex and its role in object recognition. *Vision Res*. 2001;41(10-11):1409-1422.

99. Kuniecki M, Wołoszyn K, Domagalik A, Pilarczyk J. Disentangling brain activity related to the processing of emotional visual information and emotional arousal. *Brain Struct Funct*. 2018;223(4):1589-1597.

100. Pantazatos SP, Yanagihara TK, Zhang X, Meitzler T, Hirsch J. Frontal-occipital connectivity during visual search. *Brain Connect*. 2012;2(3):164-175.

101. Uddin LQ, Kelly AM, Biswal BB, Castellanos FX, Milham MP. Functional connectivity of default mode network components: correlation, anticorrelation, and causality. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2009;30(2):625-637.

102. Spreng RN, Stevens WD, Viviano JD, Schacter DL. Attenuated anticorrelation between the default and dorsal attention networks with aging: evidence from task and rest. *Neurobiol Aging*. 2016;45:149-160.

103. Lombardo DM, Beckmann CF; Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. The intrinsic connectivity between the default mode and dorsal attention networks is an independent fMRI biomarker of Alzheimer's disease pathology burden. *Neuroimage*. 2025;321:121509.

104. Spreng RN, Turner GR. From exploration to exploitation: a shifting mental mode in late life development. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2021;25(12):1058-1071.

105. Keuken MC, Hardie A, Dorn BT, et al. The role of the left inferior frontal gyrus in social perception: an rTMS study. *Brain Res*. 2011;1383:196-205.

106. Kilner JM, Neal A, Weiskopf N, Friston KJ, Frith CD. Evidence of mirror neurons in human inferior frontal gyrus. *J Neurosci*. 2009;29(32):10153-10159.

107. Derrfuss J, Brass M, Neumann J, von Cramon DY. Involvement of the inferior frontal junction in cognitive control: meta-analyses of switching and Stroop studies. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2005;25(1):22-34.

108. Mori K, Haruno M. Resting functional connectivity of the left inferior frontal gyrus with the dorsomedial prefrontal cortex and temporoparietal junction reflects the social network size for active interactions. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2022;43(9):2869-2879.

109. Di X, Zhang H, Biswal BB. Anterior cingulate cortex differently modulates frontoparietal functional connectivity between resting-state and working memory tasks. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2020;41(7):1797-1805.

110. Le Heron C, Plant O, Manohar S, et al. Distinct effects of apathy and dopamine on effort-based decision-making in Parkinson's disease. *Brain*. 2018;141(5):1455-1469.

111. Talbot J, Cutler J, Tamm M, et al. Dopamine Boosts Motivation for Prosocial Effort in Parkinson's Disease. *J Neurosci*. 2026;46(8):e1593242024.

112. Treadway MT, Buckholtz JW, Cowan RL, et al. Dopaminergic mechanisms of individual differences in human effort-based decision-making. *J Neurosci*. 2012;32(18):6170-6176.

113. Wang Y, Toyoshima O, Kunimatsu J, Yamada H, Matsumoto M. Tonic firing mode of midbrain dopamine neurons continuously tracks reward values changing moment-by-moment. *Elife*. 2021;10:e63166.

114. Reverte I, Peris-Sampedro F, Basaure P, et al. Attentional performance, impulsivity, and related neurotransmitter systems in apoE2, apoE3, and apoE4 female transgenic mice. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2016;233(2):295-308.

115. Yoshida J, Oñate M, Khatami L, Vera J, Nadim F, Khodakhah K. Cerebellar Contributions to the Basal Ganglia Influence Motor Coordination, Reward Processing, and Movement Vigor. *J Neurosci*. 2022;42(45):8406-8415.

116. Panigrahi B, Martin KA, Li Y, et al. Dopamine Is Required for the Neural Representation and Control of Movement Vigor. *Cell*. 2015;162(6):1418-1430.

117. Fetcho RN, Parekh PK, Chou J, et al. A stress-sensitive frontostriatal circuit supporting effortful reward-seeking behavior. *Neuron*. 2024;112(3):473-487.e4.

118. Alvarez A, Aleixandre M, Linares C, Masliah E, Moessler H. Apathy and APOE4 are associated with reduced BDNF levels in Alzheimer's disease. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2014;42(4):1347-1355.

119. Kanekiyo T, Xu H, Bu G. ApoE and Aβ in Alzheimer's disease: accidental encounters or partners?. *Neuron*. 2014;81(4):740-754.

120. Sasayama D, Hattori K, Yokota Y, et al. Increased apolipoprotein E and decreased TNF-α in the cerebrospinal fluid of nondemented APOE-ε4 carriers. *Neuropsychopharmacol Rep*. 2020;40(2):201-205.

121. Han SH, Roberts JS, Mutchler JE, Burr JA. Volunteering, polygenic risk for Alzheimer's disease, and cognitive functioning among older adults. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020;253:112970.

122. Ibanez A, Matallana D, Miller B. Can prosocial values improve brain health?. *Front Neurol*. 2023;14:1202173.