# 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], Jennifer Tremblay-Mercier[3], Sylvia Villeneuve[1,3,4,5], R. Nathan Spreng[1,3,4,5], Judes Poirier[3], Laurel S. Morris[6], the PREVENT-AD Research Group, & Maiya R. Geddes[1,3,4,5,7,8]

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. Centre for Studies in the Prevention of Alzheimer's Disease, Douglas Mental Health Institute, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada.
4. McConnell Brain Imaging Centre (BIC), MNI, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
5. McGill University Research Centre for Studies in Aging, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
6. Department of Psychiatry, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, USA
7. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
8. Rotman Research Institute, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

## 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 monetary rewards obtained for oneself or for charity. Decision response (accept/reject), response time, and vigor were analyzed using mixed-effects models controlling for demographic and clinical covariates. Reward–effort relationships were modeled using various functions and compared using Bayesian model comparison. Seed-to-voxel resting-state functional connectivity from the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and anterior cingulate gyrus examined neural substrates of prosocial effort-based decision making, and ROI-to-ROI connectivity within the frontostriatal reward network was compared between APOE4 carriers and non-carriers.

*Results:* Participants were more likely to accept 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 higher bias away from effort expenditure for self-oriented compared to prosocial rewards. Across all participants, lower bias away from effort expenditure for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards was associated with vmPFC and ACCg resting-state functional connectivity to frontal, temporal, and parietal regions. APOE4 carriers showed greater overall bias away from effort expenditure but higher vigor for prosocial than self-oriented rewards, along with reduced nucleus accumbens–dorsal anterior cingulate connectivity that was associated with bias away from 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 initiating effort, 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 aging.

# Introduction

Individuals with Alzheimer's disease (AD) often show impaired decision-making capacity, which is associated with a reduced ability to perform activities of daily living autonomously (e.g., self-care, meal preparation, driving), reduced ability to make informed health-related decisions, increased financial exploitation, and heightened caregiver burden ( Davis et al., 2017; Mattos et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2021). Alterations in decision making are linked to declining cognitive abilities, decreased emotional perception, and heightened neuropsychiatric symptoms, such as apathy and depression, in AD (Sun et al., 2021). Effort-based decision making (EBDM) is the process by which individuals evaluate whether the value of a reward justifies the effort required to obtain it (Attaallah et al., 2024; Morris et al., 2025). Individuals with MCI and AD with heightened apathy have been shown to reject a higher proportion of offers to expend effort compared to those with low apathy and show reduced sensitivity to effort changes compared to healthy controls (Attaallah et al., 2024; Morris et al., 2025). Compared to younger adults, cognitively unimpaired older adults often choose more low effort options to gain rewards and have heightened sensitivity to cognitive and physical effort costs (Byrne et al., 2020; Hess et al., 2016). Disruptions in EBDM are particularly relevant to aging and AD risk, as they may hinder engagement in behaviors that protect older adults' physical and cognitive health, such as physical activity as well as social and cognitive engagement (Crawford et al., 2023; Lockwood et al., 2021; Summerside et al., 2024).

Despite the age-related changes in EBDM, aging is also characterized by a shift in social motivational priorities (Isaacowitz et al., 2021). Socioemotional Selectivity Theory suggests that as perceived time horizons shrink with age, individuals begin to prioritize social goals that enhance their positive affect rather than goals focused on information acquisition (Carstensen et al., 1999). Indeed, older adults show higher emotional regulation, sustained positive affect, and a heightened focus on maintaining close social relationships relative to younger adults (Livingstone et al., 2021; Luong et al., 2011; Nikitin et al., 2024; Radjenovic et al., 2024). Although certain cognitive processes, such as attention, executive function, and memory, decline with age, affective processing remains relatively intact, with decision-making abilities shown to be preserved in emotionally salient, interpersonal contexts (Mikels et al., 2023; Scheibe & Carstensen, 2010). Older adults have also been shown to engage in more prosocial behaviors compared to younger adults, such as volunteering and charitable giving (Cutler et al., 2021; Li et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2025; Lockwood et al., 2021). Prior studies comparing prosocial EBDM in older and younger adults have additionally shown that older adults show a greater willingness to expend effort to benefit others compared to younger adults and exert an equal amount of force when exerting effort for oneself or another (Lockwood et al., 2021). Another study found that older adults show heightened prosocial effort compared to younger adults overall but choose to exert less prosocial effort than younger adults when the probability of the reward is low due to the effort being perceived as more costly (Byrne et al., 2023). Enhanced prosociality is particularly relevant in the context of preclinical AD, as socioemotional processes, such as

affective empathy, social attention, and emotional warmth, are preserved or enhanced in older adults with early AD (Sturm & Levenson, 2019). Moreover, prosocial behaviors in older adulthood are associated with enhanced purpose in life, physical and cognitive health, and reduced loneliness and depression (Byrne et al., 2023; Chi et al., 2021; Walker et al., 2024).

Key brain regions implicated in prosocial behavior include the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) and the gyrus of the anterior cingulate cortex (ACCg). The vmPFC is thought to integrate effort costs and rewards to generate subjective valuations, particularly in socioemotional contexts (Bartra et al., 2013; Moretti et al., 2009; Winecoff et al., 2013). An fMRI study in younger adults showed that a compassion exercise was associated with increased vmPFC activity, with this neural activity predicting subsequent reductions in sedentary behavior, highlighting its role at the intersection of interpersonal experience and physical effort (Kang et al., 2018). Moreover, vmPFC activity has been shown to predict decisions to purchase social products that benefit others compared to non-social products sold for the company's commercial profit (Jung et al., 2018). Lesion studies further support the role of the vmPFC in prosocial behavior, as individuals with vmPFC damage are less generous and trustworthy in economic games (van den Bos & Güroglu, 2009). Moreover, individuals with behavioral variant frontotemporal dementia with damage to the vmPFC show decreased social emotions and cognition (Dilcher et al., 2023). Prior studies comparing EBDM to obtain rewards for oneself compared to another show that individuals with lesions to the vmPFC earn less, discount rewards by effort more steeply, exert less physical effort, and have impaired reinforcement learning when rewards are obtained for another person compared to oneself, suggesting that the vmPFC is necessary for prosocial EBDM (Gueguen et al., 2025; Lockwood et al., 2024).

Neurophysiological recordings in primates have additionally shown that ACCg neurons, but not those in the sulcus, encode rewards allocated to others and are involved in processing others' identities in social contexts, suggesting that the ACCg is particularly sensitive to socially-framed information (Chang et al., 2013; Simon & Rich, 2024). In contrast, lesions to the ACCg reduce primates' and humans' tendencies to display prosocial behavior after reinforcement learning (Basile et al., 2020; Gueguen et al., 2025). FMRI studies in humans corroborate these findings, showing heightened ACCg activity when rewards are gained for others relative to oneself and when exerting force to obtain rewards for others but not oneself (Lockwood et al., 2015; Lockwood et al., 2022). Together, these converging lines of evidence highlight the vmPFC and ACCg as core components of the neural architecture supporting prosocial EBDM. Understanding how these circuits function in older adults at elevated risk for AD is crucial, as prosocial motivation represents a potentially resilient driver of health behaviors that may protect against cognitive decline. 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 in preclinical AD prior to structural atrophy, allowing detection of subtle, preclinical alterations in socioemotional and motivational networks that influence older adults' health and well-being.

The APOE4 allele is the strongest known genetic risk factor for AD, with heterozygotes having a 3-fold increased risk of AD and homozygotes having a nearly 15-fold increased risk of AD compared to APOE3 homozygotes (Gharbi-Meliani et al., 2021; Saddiki et al., 2020). Previous studies have also shown an association between APOE4 carrier status and age-related cognitive decline, including impairments in decision making and goal-directed behavior (O'Donoghue et al., 2018; Panza et al., 2011; Zimmermann et al., 2019). Moreover, APOE4 carriers have been shown to display heightened cognitive benefits from healthy lifestyles choices that require effort, such as physical activity, diet, and social engagement (Niti et al., 2008; O'Shea et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2021. Identifying early shifts in decision making and motivation is critical for maintaining or improving the decision-making abilities of older adults at a heightened genetic risk of AD as well as supporting effortful behaviors that preserve older adults' health and well-being. The APOE4 allele contributes to widespread neural vulnerability through multiple mechanisms, such as heightened neuroinflammation, neural hyperexcitability, impaired lipid regulation, mitochondrial dysfunction, increased neuronal uptake of amyloid-β, and reduced amyloid clearance (Raulin et al., 2022). These processes can disrupt circuits essential for motivated behavior. Indeed, cognitively unimpaired older adults who carry the APOE4 allele demonstrate heightened structural vulnerability of the VTA, elevated amyloid and tau deposition in the ACC and vmPFC, reduced local efficiency functional connectivity of the NAcc and vmPFC, as well as cortical thinning and reduced cerebral blood flow and glucose metabolism in the ACC (Brown et al., 2011; Contreras et al., 2019; Hays et al., 2020; Hong et al., 2022; Leclaire et al., 2024; Therriault et al., 2021; Wearn et al., 2024). Such neural alterations may represent early markers of motivational vulnerability, particularly within frontostriatal reward circuits that support effortful decision making and goal-directed behavior.

The dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC) and vmPFC are cortical regions of the frontostriatal reward circuit that serve as an interface between limbic and motor systems during decision making (Boorman et al., 2013; Husain & Roiser, 2018). Both regions receive dopaminergic input from the VTA and NAcc and project to the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and motor regions to guide the selection and execution of effortful actions (Husain & Roiser, 2018). Moreover, the dACC receives reward-related information from the vmPFC to guide goal-directed behavior (Rolls et al., 2022). Animals with ACC lesions or ACC–NAcc disconnections show reduced willingness to exert effort for rewards, opting instead for low-effort, low-reward options (Hart et al., 2017; Hauber & Sommer, 2009). Conversely, human neuromodulation studies demonstrate that stimulating the dACC can evoke a strong determination to persevere during challenges (Caruana et al., 2018; Parvizi et al., 2013). In healthy aging, greater dACC cortical thickness and stronger dACC functional connectivity have been linked to the exceptional perseverance and tenacity observed in "superagers" (Touroutoglou et al., 2020). Together, these findings suggest that APOE4-related alterations in frontostriatal reward circuitry may influence early motivational changes and EBDM.

The primary aim of the present study was to compare EBDM for prosocial versus self-oriented rewards in older adults at risk for AD and to identify the neural substrates associated with prosocial EBDM. Guided by evidence that motivational priorities shift with age toward valuing others' well-being, we hypothesized that all participants would exert heightened effort for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards, and that prosocial EBDM would be associated with rsFC from the vmPFC and ACCg. We further hypothesized that APOE4 carriers would exhibit impaired EBDM (i.e., reduced willingness to exert effort, higher reward values to initiate effort, reduced reward sensitivity) compared to non-carriers. Finally, we predicted that APOE4 carriers would show reduced rsFC between the VTA, nucleus accumbens, dorsal ACC, and vmPFC of the reward network, and that these disruptions would correlate with alterations in EBDM behavior.

# 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 (Villeneuve et al., 2025). All individuals were enrolled in an optional sub-study, a randomized controlled trial aimed at increasing physical activity, and the data used in the present analyses were collected at baseline, prior to intervention onset. Details of the intervention, including eligibility criteria, have been reported previously (Walker et al., 2025). The PREVENT-AD cohort comprises adults aged 55 years and older with a first-degree family history of Alzheimer's disease who are cognitively unimpaired at enrolment (Villeneuve et al., 2025).

## Materials

### The MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status

A scale used for assessing subjectively perceived socioeconomic status (SES; Adler et al., 2000). 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 (Kroenke et al., 2001). 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.

## Apathy Evaluation Scale – Self-report

A questionnaire that consists of 18 items for assessing self-reported apathy (e.g., "I am interested in things."; "Getting things started on my own is important to me."; Marin et al., 1991). Each item is rated on a 4-point Likert scale where 1 = *Not at all true* and 4 = *Very true*. Items are summed, giving total scores ranging between 18 to 72, with higher scores reflecting higher apathy.

## Effort-Based Decision-Making Task

The Effort Expenditure for Rewards Task (EEfRT) is an objective measure of motivation and anhedonia, and the present study utilized an adapted version of this task (Morris et al., 2020; Treadway et al., 2009) The task used in the current study is a 120-trial paradigm where participants are asked whether they would be willing to perform a certain amount of work for a given reward. On each trial, the participant is presented with an amount and type of reward, as well as the amount of effort required to attain that reward. There are 6 levels of reward ($0.50, $1.00, $1.50, $2.00, $2.50, $3.00) and two conditions (prosocial, self-oriented). For self-oriented reward trials, participants work to attain the reward for themselves, while for prosocial reward trials, they work to have that reward donated to a charity of their choice. The "effort" in the task involves the participant repeatedly alternating between the left and right arrow keys on their keyboard, with each button press raising the level of a virtual "bar" viewed onscreen by the participant. A virtual target line viewed onscreen represents the amount of effort the participants are asked to perform for that trial. The virtual target line is set at one of five heights: level 1 = 3 presses, level 2 = 20 presses, level 3 = 37 presses, level 4 = 54 presses, level 5 = 70 presses. Upon being presented with the reward amount, reward type, and required effort for the trial, participants respond "yes" or "no" to expending the required effort for that trial by pressing the 'y' or 'n' on their keyboards. On one third of trials that a participant responds "yes" to, they are asked to complete the amount of work presented for that trial. On all other "yes" trials and all "no" trials, participants are not asked to do any work and the task automatically proceeds to the next decision trial. Participants are informed at the beginning of the task that one of the trials they successfully complete will be selected at random, and they will receive the reward presented during that trial. Each of the 60 possible reward level, reward type, and effort level combinations are repeated twice.




**Figure 1.** The effort-based decision-making task is an effort-discounting task with 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.

### Repeatable Battery for the Assessment of Neuropsychological Status

This neuropsychological battery was developed to measure five cognitive domains: Immediate Memory (i.e., list learning, story remembering), Visuospatial Ability (i.e., figure copy, line orientation), Language (i.e., picture naming, semantic fluency), Attention (i.e., digit span, coding), and Delayed Memory (i.e., list recognition, story recall, figure recall; Randolph et al., 1998). A standard score for each domain, as well as a total score, were normed with a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15.

## Procedure

Multi-echo functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) scans used in this study were collected from the PREVENT-AD cohort in 2021-2022, and all behavioral data were collected between 2021 and 2024. Study procedures were approved by the McGill University Research Ethics Board. Participants from the PREVENT-AD cohort were recruited for an optional sub-study by contacting them via phone and email and by sending flyers in the mail. All eligible participants then attended a videoconferenced meeting with a member of the research team, where they were provided with detailed information about study procedures and were given the opportunity to ask any questions. All participants provided written informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Participants completed an online battery of questionnaires administered through the REDCap platform, followed by the EBDM task.

## APOE Genotyping

All participants were genotyped for APOE through a blood draw. DNA was isolated from 200 $\mu$l 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 in a 3T Siemens Magnetom Prisma MRI scanner using a 32-channel head coil (Siemens Medical Solutions, Erlangen, Germany). T1-weighted structural images were acquired using an MPRAGE (Magnetization-Prepared Rapid Gradient-Echo) imaging sequence. The parameters included a repetition time (TR) of 2300 milliseconds (ms), echo time (TE) of 2.96 ms, inversion time (TI) of 900 ms, flip angle of 9°, Field of View (FOV) of 256 millimeters (mm), phase encode A-P, a GRAPPA acceleration factor of 2, and a Bandwidth (BW) of 625 Hz/px. The rsfMRI data were acquired by an echo-planar imaging (EPI) sequence. The scanning duration for each run was 5.04 minutes and two sessions were performed continuously with an eyes closed acquisition protocol. The parameters were as follows: 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. Forty-eight slices were collected in each run.

The preprocessing of both functional and structural data was performed using the fMRIprep pipeline. First, the structural images underwent skull stripping using a Nipype implementation of the antsBrainExtraction.sh tool (ANTs), an atlas-based brain extraction workflow. Next, brain tissue was segmented with FSL fast and normalized to Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space using ANT's antsRegistration. Preprocessing for the resting-state functional images included head motion correction, realignment, slice timing correction, susceptibility distortion correction, co-registration to reconstructed structural images, and spatial normalization to standard space. For each BOLD run, the BOLD time-series was averaged to generate a reference volume. The BOLD reference was co-registered to the T1W reference using bbregister, implementing a boundary-based registration with six degrees of freedom. Head motion parameters with respect to the BOLD reference (one rigid-body transformation, three rotations, and three translations) were estimated with FSL's mcflirt. Then, the rigid-body transformation was applied to re-sample the BOLD time series onto their original, native space. Transformations were concatenated to map the BOLD image to MNI standard space. Potential confounds were estimated, including the mean global signal, mean tissue signal class, tCompCor, aCompCor, Framewise Displacement, and DVARS. Volumes with framewise displacement above 0.9 mm and/or global blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) signal changes above 3 standard deviations were flagged as motion outliers. No participants in the current study had data that exceeded these motion thresholds. All dummy scans were removed prior to any additional analyses.

Denoising was performed on the fMRIprep outputs using Tedana (DuPre et al., 2021; Kundu et al., 2012; Kundu et al., 2013). The signal across echoes were combined using a weighted average and then normalized across echoes. A time series for the optimally combined echoes was then extracted. Principal component analysis was applied to the optimally combined data to separate the BOLD signal from thermal noise. Then, independent component analysis denoising was performed. This step uses a TE-dependence model to classify principal component analysis

components as BOLD or non-BOLD while removing motion and physiological noise. Finally, the functional data were smoothed using a full-width half-maximum kernel of 6 mm in the CONN toolbox (Whitfield-Gabrieli et al., 2012).

# 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.

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 *lmer* function from the lme4 package in R was used for the linear mixed models. Vigor was defined as the number of button presses per second, using the following equation: Effort (number of button presses) / Work trial duration (seconds). Any response time or vigor values > 2 SD above each participant's mean was removed prior to analyses. All models included age, sex, years of education, SES, APOE4 status, MCI status, and depression as covariates of non-interest. 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 False Discovery Rate correction to adjust for multiple comparisons.

## Computational Modelling

To characterize the maximum amount of effort participants were willing to exert at each reward level, individual effort-reward curves were modelled using linear, sigmoid, and Weibull functions (Morris et al., 2020). Models were fit separately for each condition and participant using variational Bayes model inversion implemented in the VBA toolbox (MATLAB R2023b; Daunizeau et al., 2014). Curve fitting was conducted within a mixed-effects framework to minimize the influence of outliers on parameter estimates. Specifically, after an initial round of model inversion, the resulting participant-level posterior estimates were used to approximate a Gaussian population-level distribution. This estimated distribution was then used as the prior for the next iteration of inversion. The procedure was repeated until convergence, defined as no further improvement in group-level model evidence. Because data from both the prosocial and self-oriented conditions contributed to the shared group prior, this iterative approach likely provides a conservative estimate of condition differences by shrinking individual parameters toward the group mean.

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

1. Linear:
$$y = mx + c$$
where $m$ is the slope and $c$ is the intercept.

2. Sigmoid:
$$y = c \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \exp\left(-(x - \text{bias})/\sigma\right)}$$
where *bias* determines the horizontal shift of the curve (tendency to avoid effort at a given reward) and $\sigma$ 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 then used to determine which function best described the effort–reward relationship. Model selection was based on protected exceedance probability, the probability that a given model is more prevalent than all competing models while accounting for chance fluctuations in model evidence. To confirm that the same model provided the best fit across both conditions, between-condition random-effects model selection was performed on the same set of models.

The reliability of the model-derived parameters was assessed through a simulation-recovery procedure using 1,000 parameter sets sampled from the group-level posterior distribution. Using these sampled parameters, synthetic datasets were generated with the same number of trials and reward levels as the real task. Each synthetic dataset was then re-inverted using the same model inversion procedure and recovered parameter estimates were correlated with the original sampled values using product moment correlations. Finally, parameter estimates from the winning model were extracted for each participant and condition. Linear mixed models (*lmer* function of lme4 R package) were used to examine the effect of condition (fixed effect) on parameter estimates, with subject-level random intercepts and age, sex, years of education, SES, APOE4 status, MCI status, and depression included as covariates of non-interest. Additional models were conducted with condition x APOE4 status included as an interaction term to examine differences between carriers and non-carriers.

## Resting-state fMRI

Analyses of resting-state fMRI data were performed using the CONN toolbox (RRID:SCR_009550) release 22.v2407 (Whitfield-Gabrieli et al., 2012). For any model parameters demonstrating significant differences between conditions, difference scores between conditions were calculated for each participant to index greater prosocial relative to self-oriented

effort in decision making (e.g., bias difference score = $bias_{self\text{-}oriented} - bias_{prosocial}$). Seed-to-voxel analyses were conducted to examine associations between EBDM difference scores and rsFC. Seed-based connectivity maps (SBC) were estimated characterizing the patterns of functional connectivity from seeds of interest to the rest of the brain. Seeds included the vmPFC and ACCg based on prior research showing their involvement in prosocial, relative to self-oriented, EBDM. The vmPFC seed was functionally defined using a mask from a meta-analytic conjunction analysis on the neural correlates of subjective value, and the ACCg seed was derived from an anatomically defined mask shown to be unique for prosocial compared to self-oriented EBDM in younger adults.[29,40] Functional connectivity strength was represented by Fisher-transformed bivariate correlation coefficients from a weighted general linear model (weighted-GLM), defined separately for each pair of seed and target areas, modeling the association between their BOLD signal timeseries. To compensate for possible transient magnetization effects at the beginning of each run, individual scans were weighted by a step function convolved with an SPM canonical hemodynamic response function and rectified. Group-level analyses were performed using a General Linear Model (GLM). In two separate models for each seed region, bias difference scores were included as the predictors of interest. Age, sex, years of education, socioeconomic status, APOE4 carrier status, depression, MCI status, and mean framewise displacement were included as covariates of non-interest. For each individual voxel a separate GLM was estimated, with first-level connectivity measures at this voxel as dependent variables. Voxel-level hypotheses were evaluated using multivariate parametric statistics with random-effects across subjects and sample covariance estimation across multiple measurements. Inferences were performed at the level of individual clusters (groups of contiguous voxels). Cluster-level inferences were based on parametric statistics from Gaussian Random Field theory. Results were thresholded using a combination of a cluster-forming $p < 0.001$ voxel-level threshold, and a familywise corrected p-FDR $< 0.05$ cluster-size threshold.

ROI-to-ROI analyses were conducted to examine differences in rsFC between APOE4 carriers and non-carriers in the reward circuit comprising the VTA, NAcc, dACC, and vmPFC. The VTA ROI was anatomically defined using a probabilistic atlas from 7T MRI, right and left NAcc ROIs were anatomically defined using the Harvard-Oxford Subcortical Atlas, the dACC was anatomically defined from the Desikan-Killiany atlas, and the vmPFC functionally defined from a meta-analysis on the neural correlates of subjective valuation (Bartra et al., 2013; Desikan et al., 2006; Rushmore et al., 2022; Trutti et al., 2021). ROI-to-ROI connectivity matrices were estimated characterizing the functional connectivity between each pair of regions. Functional connectivity strength was represented by Fisher-transformed bivariate correlation coefficients from a general linear model (weighted-GLM), estimated separately for each pair of ROIs, characterizing the association between their BOLD signal timeseries. Group-level analyses were performed using a General Linear Model (GLM). The predictor of interest was an APOE4 carrier > APOE4 non-carrier contrast, with age, sex, years of education, SES, depression, MCI status, and mean framewise displacement included as covariates of non-interest. For each individual connection a separate GLM was estimated, with first-level connectivity measures at this

connection as dependent variables. False discovery rate (FDR) multiple comparison correction was applied across all edges of the correlation matrix with $p < .05$ to identify significant connections. Connections that survived FDR correction were then entered into exploratory post-hoc linear regression models, in which EBDM indices that differed between APOE4 carriers and non-carriers served as predictors of interest, with age, sex, education, SES, depression, and MCI status included as covariates.

Functional connectivity multivariate pattern analyses (fc-MVPA) were performed to examine data-driven associations between EBDM between-condition difference scores and rsFC as well as differences in rsFC between APOE4 carriers and non-carriers. Fc-MVPA estimated the first 5 eigenpatterns characterizing the principal axes of heterogeneity in functional connectivity across subjects. From these eigenpatterns, 5 associated eigenpattern-score images were derived for each individual subject characterizing their brain-wide functional connectome state. Eigenpatterns and eigenpattern-scores were computed separately for each individual seed voxel as the left- and right- singular vectors, respectively, from a singular value decomposition (group-level SVD) of the matrix of functional connectivity values between this seed voxel and the rest of the brain (a matrix with one row per target voxel, and one column per subject). Individual functional connectivity values were computed from the matrices of bivariate correlation coefficients between the BOLD timeseries from each pair of voxels, estimated using a singular value decomposition of the z-score normalized BOLD signal (subject-level SVD) with 64 components separately for each subject. Group-level analyses were performed using a General Linear Model (GLM). For each individual voxel a separate GLM was estimated, with first-level connectivity measures at this voxel as dependent variables. Voxel-level hypotheses were evaluated using multivariate parametric statistics with random-effects across subjects and sample covariance estimation across multiple measurements. Inferences were performed at the level of individual clusters (groups of contiguous voxels). Cluster-level inferences were based on parametric statistics from Gaussian Random Field theory. Results were thresholded using a combination of a cluster-forming $p < 0.001$ voxel-level threshold, and a familywise corrected p-FDR $< 0.05$ cluster-size threshold. Significant clusters of $k > 50$ were followed up with post-hoc seed-to-voxel analyses (identical models as described above).

# Results

## Participant Demographics

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 groups in any characteristics.

**Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of the full sample ($M \pm SD$).

| | 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<br>Male = 14 | Female = 14<br>Male = 4 | Female = 24<br>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<br>MCI = 11 | CU = 15<br>MCI = 3 | CU = 26<br>MCI = 8 |
| Depression (PHQ-9) | 2.38 ± 2.53 | 2.56 ± 2.25 | 2.29 ± 2.69 |
| Apathy (Apathy Evaluation Scale) | 30.28 ± 5.92 | 29.47 ± 6.57 | 30.76 ± 5.57 |
| 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 prosocial rewards significantly increased the likelihood of choosing to exert effort compared to self-oriented rewards ($\beta = 0.682$, SE = 0.313, $z = 2.18$, $p = .029$, OR = 1.98, 95% CI [1.07, 3.65]). There was also a significant interaction between reward value and effort level across both conditions ($\beta = 0.01$, SE = 0.002, $z = 2.07$, $p = .039$, OR = 1.01, 95% CI [1, 1.01]). Post-hoc contrasts showed that the probability of accepting effort decreased significantly as effort demands increased when rewards were \$0.50 - \$2.50. When rewards were \$3.00, however, the probability of accepting effort did not significantly differ between effort levels. Further, main effects of effort and reward showed that higher effort levels significantly decreased the probability of accepting effort overall

(β = -0.038, SE = 0.01, z = -7.58, p = < .001, OR = 0.96, 95% CI [0.95, 0.97]) and higher reward values significantly increased the probability of accepting effort overall ((β = 1.10, SE = 0.123, z = 8.94, p = <.001, OR = 3.01, 95% CI [2.37, 3.84]).

Results of the linear mixed effects model on response times showed that response times were significantly higher in the prosocial compared to the self-oriented reward condition (β = 0.18, SE = 0.01, t = 2.00, p = .045). There was also a significant reward x effort interaction on response times (β = 0.001, SE = 0.0001, t = 1.96, p = .0496). Specifically, for low levels of effort (3 and 20 button presses), response times decreased as reward values increased whereas for the highest level of effort (70 presses), response times increased as reward values increased. Moreover, response times increased as effort levels increased when rewards were $0.50-$1.50, while no differences in response times were observed between effort levels when rewards were $2.00-$3.00. The effect of condition on response vigor did not reach statistical significance (p > .05).




**Figure 2.** The probability of accepting effort is significantly higher for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards (Panel A) and remains stable across effort levels in both conditions only when reward values are $3.00 (Panel B). Decision response times were significantly higher in the prosocial compared to self-oriented reward condition (Panel C) and decreased as reward values increased when low levels of effort were required (3 and 20 presses) but increased as reward

values increased when the highest amount of effort (70 presses) were required in both conditions. *$p < .05$.

## 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 = .896 for sigma and r = .935 for bias in the prosocial condition, and r = .905 for sigma and r = .936 for bias in the self-oriented condition.

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




**Figure 4.** 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 (Panels B and C).

### Behavioral Differences between APOE4 Carriers and Non-Carriers

There was a significant condition x APOE4 status interaction on response vigor ($\beta$ = -0.537, SE = 0.207, t = -2.59, p = .010). Post-hoc comparisons showed that vigor was higher for APOE4 carriers than non-carriers in the prosocial condition, while there were no significant differences between groups in the self-oriented reward condition. There was also a significant effect of APOE4 status on bias, with carriers having heightened bias away from effort expenditure across both conditions relative to non-carriers ($\beta$ = 0.10, SE = 0.01, t = 2.15, p = .037).




**Figure 5.** 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 for both types of reward (Panel B).

## Resting-State fMRI Results

### Region of Interest Analyses

'Effort Bias' difference scores (Self-oriented – Prosocial) across all participants were associated with enhanced rsFC between the vmPFC seed and the left dorsomedial PFC (t(39) = 5.22, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [00, 38, 44], k = 86). Bias difference scores were also associated with enhanced rsFC between the ACCg seed and two clusters in the left inferior frontal gyrus, pars triangularis (cluster 1: t(39) = 6.32, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [-42, 26, 14], k = 149; cluster 2: t(39) = 4.66, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [-54, 26, 20], k = 47) and anticorrelated rsFC between the ACCg seed and the right superior lateral occipital cortex (t(39) = -6.07, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [30, -78, 44], k = 108), right superior parietal lobule (t(39) = -4.69, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [30, -52, 60], k = 51), right anterior middle/inferior

temporal gyrus (t(39) = -6.43, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [60, -8, 8], k = 50), and right dorsolateral PFC (t(39) = -6.04, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [24, 12, 42], k = 48).




**Figure 6.** Seed-to-voxel resting-state functional connectivity associated with bias difference scores (self-oriented – prosocial). Higher bias away from effort expenditure for self-oriented relative to prosocial 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 (negative rsFC). Results are overlaid on a standard template and corrected for multiple comparisons.

The ROI-to-ROI group analyses within the reward network comprising the VTA, NAcc, dACC, and vmPFC 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, b = -0.257, SE = 0.11, t(40) = -2.32, p = .025.




**Figure 7.** *APOE4* carriers had reduced rsFC between the dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and right nucleus accumbens relative to non-carriers. Results are overlaid on a standard template and are corrected for multiple comparisons.

## Multivariate Pattern Analyses

Fc-MVPA additionally showed that bias difference scores between prosocial and self-oriented conditions were associated with three clusters in the vmPFC across all participants: one posterior vmPFC cluster spanning both hemispheres and extending into subcallosal cortex (labelled 1 in Figure 7A; $F(5, 35) = 9.09$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [00, 04, 28], k = 676), one anterior vmPFC cluster extending into the bilateral, medial frontal poles (labelled 3 in Figure 7A; $F(5, 35) = 5.05$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [02, 56, -28], k = 298), and another posterior vmPFC cluster in the right hemisphere (labelled 2 in Figure 7A; $F(5, 35) = 8.05$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [18, 50, 10], k = 96).

Post-hoc seed-to-voxel analyses using each cluster as a seed region showed that bias difference scores were associated with enhanced rsFC between the posterior vmPFC/subcallosal cortex seed (seed 1 in Figure8A) and a cluster in the right dorsolateral PFC ($t(39) = 5.78$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [28, 44, 36], k = 61) and reduced rsFC with the right lateral occipital cortex ($t(39) = -7.02$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [52, -72, 08], k = 268). Bias difference scores were also associated with enhanced rsFC between the anterior vmPFC/frontal pole seed (seed 3 in Figure 8A) and the right temporal pole ($t(39) = 6.64$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [32, 04, 26], k = 199), left temporal pole ($t(39) = 5.02$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [-46, 20, -34], k = 95), and right frontal pole ($t(39) = 4.96$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [12, 56, 14], k = 55) as well as reduced rsFC with the left lateral occipital cortex / superior parietal lobule ($t(39) = -6.14$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [-36, -52, 54], k = 93), left postcentral gyrus ($t(39) = -6.61$, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [-50, -16, 50], k = 65), and left temporoparietal junction ($t(39) = -$

5.64, peak voxel MNI coordinates = [-54, -40, 54], k = 54). Fc-MVPA did not reveal any significant clusters in *APOE4* carriers relative to non-carriers.




**Figure 8.** Whole-brain functional connectivity multivariate pattern analyses showing seeds associated with bias difference scores (self-oriented – prosocial). 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 focused on EBDM in older adults at risk for AD. Given the enhanced social motivation and prosocial behavior seen in aging and relatively preserved socioemotional functioning in AD, the primary aim of this study was to compare EBDM for prosocial and self-oriented monetary rewards and rsFC underlying prosocial EBDM in older adults at risk for AD (Isaacowitz et al., 2021; Lockwood et al., 2021; Sturm & Levenson, 2019). We also examined differences in EBDM and rsFC between carriers and non-carriers of the APOE4 allele, a known genetic risk factor for AD (Raulin et al., 2022). All participants were more willing to exert effort and required lower reward values to initiate effort for prosocial than self-oriented rewards, coupled with a longer time to decision threshold when accepting to perform effort for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards. Greater bias towards prosocial relative to self-oriented effort was marked by reduced vmPFC-dorsomedial PFC rsFC, reduced ACCg-left inferior frontal gyrus rsFC, and enhanced ACCg rsFC with lateral occipital cortex, superior parietal lobule, inferior/middle temporal gyrus, and dorsolateral PFC. Compared to non-carriers, *APOE4* carriers showed reduced functional connectivity within the reward network (i.e., dACC-NAcc) that was associated with bias away from effort expenditure in both conditions.

Analyses comparing EBDM between conditions showed that the probability of accepting effort was higher and bias away from effort expenditure was lower for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards. These findings are consistent with prior research showing heightened prosocial behavior and a heightened valuation of actions that benefit others in aging (Isaacowitz et al., 2021). The current findings partially align with a prior study that investigated prosocial EBDM in older and younger adults that reported that older adults showed reduced reward-effort discounting for prosocial rewards compared to younger adults, but higher discounting for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards in within-groups comparisons between conditions (Lockwood et al., 2021). These divergent results might reflect differences in the EBDM tasks. The prior study examined effort expenditure through a handheld dynamometer that was squeezed after every trial, while the current task used button presses that were required on only 30% of trials, which might have been perceived as less costly. This interpretation would align with prior research showing that prosocial behaviour is enhanced in older adults when perceived effort costs are reduced (Byrne et al., 2023). Moreover, the previous study used credits gained for oneself or another as a reward, which might be perceived as less valuable or personally meaningful than charitable donations. Indeed, prior research has shown that charitable donations increase across the lifespan, even after controlling for socioeconomic status, and older adults display heightened prosocial behavior when sharing money or resources relative to providing direct help or emotional comfort for others.

In addition to differences observed between reward conditions, the probability of accepting effort declined as required effort increased and reward value decreased for low to intermediate incentives ($0.50–$2.50), consistent with effort discounting. In contrast, when

rewards were high ($3.00), acceptance rates remained stable across effort levels, indicating that reward magnitude was sufficient to offset effort costs for both prosocial and self-oriented rewards. Together, these findings suggest that, in older adults at risk for Alzheimer's disease, effort sensitivity is modifiable and that sufficiently large incentives can override effort discounting. These results have important practical implications for motivating effortful behavior in at-risk older adults. Small incentives may be insufficient when tasks become demanding and increases in effort without commensurate increases in reward may contribute to behavioral disengagement. Accordingly, intervention strategies may benefit from strategically deploying larger or more salient incentives during periods when effort demands are highest, such as during the initiation of a behavior change program or when difficulty is increased, to sustain engagement and adherence.

Consistent with the previous study, older adults did not differ in vigor for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards (Lockwood et al., 2021). This suggests that prosocial incentives may be particularly effective for shaping decisions to initiate effortful actions in older adults at risk for AD, even though the actual level of physical effort they exert remains comparable across reward types. Similarly, the slope of the effort–reward sigmoid function, representing the rate at which participants increased their exerted effort as reward magnitude grew, did not differ between prosocial and self-oriented conditions. This suggests that older adults were equally sensitive to increases in reward size regardless of who benefited, indicating that the basic valuation of reward magnitude is stable across prosocial and self-oriented conditions. 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 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 significantly longer to reach a decision threshold when deciding to exert effort for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards. Prior work indicates that longer response times reflect increased cognitive demands during decision making. In contexts where the most rewarding option is also the most effortful, individuals tend to default toward easier and more immediate options, and overriding this bias requires additional deliberative processing (Bowyer et al., 2021; Sideridis & Alahmadi, 2022; Zucchelli et al., 2025). One interpretation of the present findings is therefore that prosocial actions may be perceived as more costly, potentially because their benefits are less immediate and less self-directed. As a result, engaging in prosocial effort may require greater deliberation, drawing on processes such as inhibitory control, value integration, and mentalizing (Pollerhoff et al., 2025). Future work should directly test this possibility by manipulating cognitive load, inhibitory control demands, the timing of reward receipt, or the degree of mentalizing required during prosocial versus self-oriented effort-based decisions. In addition, response times showed a reward × effort interaction. When effort demands were low, higher rewards facilitated faster decisions, whereas when effort demands were high, higher rewards were associated with longer response times. This pattern suggests that under low-effort conditions, reward value may more

readily dominate the decision process, enabling faster and more automatic responding. In contrast, when effort costs are high, larger rewards appear to increase deliberation, consistent with heightened cost–benefit conflict as participants evaluate whether the reward sufficiently compensates for the required effort.

Both the seed-to-voxel analysis and fc-MVPA showed converging evidence that greater prosocial (relative to self-oriented) effort-based decision making was associated with stronger rsFC in the vmPFC, a region of the default mode and limbic networks that integrates value and socioemotional information to guide decision making (Bartra et al., 2013; Kang et al., 2018; Lockwood et al., 2024; Moretti et al., 2009; Winecoff et al., 2013). Fc-MVPA revealed the involvement of multiple vmPFC clusters spanning posterior vmPFC and subcallosal cortex as well as a more anterior region extending into the medial frontal poles. Meta-analytic evidence similarly shows rostral-caudal functional organization of vmPFC, and links anterior vmPFC with social cognition, valuation, and decision-making, whereas posterior vmPFC is associated with emotion regulation and mood-related processes (Hiser & Koenigs, 2018). Posterior vmPFC extending into subcallosal cortex integrates how emotionally or motivationally relevant a situation or decision is via limbic projections, whereas anterior vmPFC may implement the choice to act or refrain based on these valuations (Hiser & Koenigs, 2018; Roy et al., 2012). The finding that individuals with heightened prosocial, relative to self-oriented EBDM showed enhanced rsFC in both anterior and posterior vmPFC aligns with models positioning prosocial decisions as requiring integration across valuation, social cognitive, and affective processing systems (Rahal & Fiedler, 2022). Prosocial decisions in aging often depend on linking the value of helping others to personally meaningful goals and emotional context to drive behavior and therefore appear to implicate co-engagement of both vmPFC subdivisions (Isaacowitz et al., 2021).

To elucidate the neural correlates of individual differences in prosocial relative to self-oriented bias towards effort expenditure, we examined rsFC of a region of the vmPFC of the valuation system identified by a meta-analytic conjunction analysis (Bartra et al., 2013). Lower bias away from effort expenditure for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards was associated with stronger rsFC between this vmPFC seed and a cluster in the left dmPFC, a key node in social cognition involved in perspective taking, self-referential processing, and affective mentalizing (Bzdok et al., 2013; Eickhoff et al., 2016; Jimenez & Meyer, 2024; Wagner et al., 2016). More rostral dmPFC regions, including the cluster identified, are preferentially connected with default mode and limbic areas (including vmPFC) and are engaged when evaluating others' intentions and emotional states (Bzdok et al., 2013; Eickhoff et al., 2016). While the vmPFC integrates affective and reward value, the dmPFC contributes higher-order social and metacognitive evaluations (Bzdok et al., 2013). Prior work shows vmPFC–dmPFC co-activation during task-based social cognition fMRI studies, and dmPFC activity often scales with the cognitive or physical effort devoted to valued goals (Bzdok et al., 2013; Clairis et al., 2024). Thus, enhanced vmPFC–dmPFC connectivity in individuals with stronger prosocial EBDM may reflect tighter coupling between valuation processes and social-cognitive representations, a hypothesis to be tested in future work. This integration may support the ability to perceive helping others as being personally meaningful and emotionally salient, thereby increasing their willingness to invest effort on behalf of others relative to oneself.

Lower bias away from exerting effort for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards was also associated with increased rsFC between the posterior vmPFC/subcallosal cortex cluster and the right dorsolateral PFC (dlPFC), and reduced rsFC between the posterior vmPFC/subcallosal cortex and the lateral occipital cortex. While the posterior vmPFC/subcallosal region is closely connected to limbic structures and integrates affective information into value representations, the dorsolateral PFC is a hub of the frontoparietal control network involved in planning and goal-directed behavior (Botvinick & An, 2009; Morris et al., 2014). Enhanced vmPFC-dlPFC connectivity is associated with goal simulation, generative desire (i.e., the desire to contribute to the well-being of future generations), and prioritizing options that benefit others more than the self (Baumgartner et al., 2011; Gerlach et al., 2014; Walker et al., 2024). In contrast, the lateral occipital cortex is part of perceptual and attention networks that support externally directed object recognition (Grill-Spector et al., 2001). Prior fMRI research has shown co-activation of the vmPFC and lateral occipital cortex during goal-directed attention and visual regions have been shown to provide sensory information to the vmPFC to guide action selection (Hiser & Koenigs, 2018; Kuniecki et al., 2018; Pantazatos et al., 2012). Stronger vmPFC–dlPFC connectivity, paired with weaker vmPFC–lateral occipital rsFC, raises the possibility that individuals with greater prosocial motivation may rely more on internally guided, affective goal-relevant representations and less on external, perceptual stimuli when deciding to exert prosocial relative to self-oriented effort.

Positive rsFC between the anterior vmPFC/frontal pole cluster and the bilateral temporal poles, together with negative rsFC between this vmPFC cluster and regions in the lateral occipital cortex, superior parietal lobule, postcentral gyrus, and left TPJ, suggests a shift toward internally guided, socioemotional valuation processes that promote prosocial over externally-guided decision making. The temporal poles, which are strongly connected to the vmPFC via the uncinate fasciculus, form a paralimbic hub involved in integrating emotional and social meaning, and both the vmPFC and temporal poles comprise a limbic subsystem of the default mode network supporting empathy, moral reasoning, and the valuation of others' outcomes (Fan et al., 2014; Girn et al., 2024; Olson et al., 2007). Conversely, anticorrelated vmPFC rsFC with occipital and parietal regions, nodes of perceptual and attention networks, likely reflects diminished reliance on externally oriented, stimulus-driven processing during prosocial EBDM (Uddin et al., 2009). Anticorrelated rsFC between default mode and perceptual-attentional networks is typically reduced in aging and associated with cognitive decline and AD-related pathology (Lombardo et al., 2025; Spreng et al., 2016). Given that prosocial choices often rely on affective meaning, empathy, personal values, and representations of others' needs, processes associated with the default mode network, greater anticorrelated rsFC between internal and external networks may allow these internal value computations to operate with less interference from externally oriented cues (e.g., changing effort demands, irrelevant sensory information).

Lower bias away from prosocial effort expenditure was also associated with enhanced rsFC between the ACCg and two clusters in the left inferior frontal gyrus (IFG), and reduced rsFC between the ACCg and clusters in the right lateral occipital cortex, superior parietal lobule (SPL), inferior/middle temporal gyrus (ITG/MTG), and dorsolateral PFC (dlPFC). The ACCg is a central hub of the social brain, implicated in monitoring others' outcomes, encoding social value, and supporting prosocial choices through its integration with regions involved in mentalizing, semantic processing, and action understanding (Basile et al., 2020; Chang et al.,

2013; Lockwood et al., 2015; Lockwood et al., 2022; Simon & Rich, 2024). The left IFG, which co-activates with the ACC during semantic processing, cognitive control, and emotion regulation (Derrfuss et al., 2005; Mori & Haruno, 2022) may strengthen the integration of socially meaningful information with motivational signals in the ACCg. Moreover, parts of the left IFG have been hypothesized to include mirror neurons crucial for the social perception of emotions (Keuken et al., 2011; Kilner et al., 2009). Stronger ACCg–IFG coupling may therefore facilitate interpreting others' intentions and mapping them onto effortful behavior. In contrast, reduced ACCg connectivity with the SPL, dlPFC, and ITG/MTG, nodes of the frontoparietal control and somatomotor networks, suggests weaker coupling between social–motivational processes and externally oriented action-planning and executive systems associated with heightened prosocial EBDM (Botvinick & An, 2009; Morese et al., 2022; Wang et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2024; Whitney et al., 2011; Zanini et al., 2023). These regions support visuospatial attention and the recognition of others' actions, indicating that prosocial effort decisions may rely less on deliberative control or visuospatial planning than self-oriented decisions. This interpretation aligns with evidence that ACC–frontoparietal connectivity increases during cognitively demanding tasks but decreases at rest when motivational priorities dominate action selection (Di et al., 2020).

Comparisons between APOE4 carriers and non-carriers showed no differences in the probability of accepting effort, response times, or reward sensitivity for prosocial and self-oriented rewards, suggesting that prosocial motivation itself was relatively preserved in carriers. However, APOE4 carriers exhibited higher vigor for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards as well as a higher overall bias away from exerting effort for both reward types, indicating that the maximum effort they were willing to accept at a given reward value was lower than for non-carriers. Together, these findings suggest that APOE4 carriers may be more constrained in how effort is expressed, showing a generalized tendency to avoid effort, but heightened energization of behavior when engaging in prosocial actions once a decision to act has been made. These findings may reflect altered reward valuation processes or dopaminergic signaling among APOE4 carriers (Le Heron et al., 2018; Talbot et al., 2025; Treadway et al., 2012). Midbrain dopamine neurons exhibit both tonic activity, which supports sustained motivational drive and effort tolerance, and phasic bursts, which invigorate behavior and update ongoing decisions in response to salient rewards (Wang et al., 2021). In this context, higher effort bias could reflect diminished tonic dopaminergic support, whereas elevated vigor for prosocial rewards may indicate relatively preserved or even enhanced phasic responsiveness to prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards. Such a pattern is consistent with emerging evidence that social and emotional rewards remain salient in individuals at elevated risk for AD (Sturm & Levenson, 2018). These findings also align with prior evidence that APOE4 carriers are at increased risk for apathy, a syndrome characterized by reduced motivation to initiate and sustain goal-directed behavior (D'Onofrio et al., 2011). Importantly, the present results were observed despite no group differences in global cognition as measured by the RBANS and after controlling for MCI status, suggesting that subtle alterations in motivational and reward processing may precede overt cognitive impairment. This pattern is consistent with evidence that AD-related pathology can give rise to apathy independently of cognitive decline, highlighting motivational dysfunction as a potential early behavioral marker of disease risk (Mehak et al., 2023).

Relative to non-carriers, APOE4 carriers showed reduced rsFC between the right NAcc and dACC, with this rsFC being negatively associated with bias away from effort expenditure in both conditions. This finding is consistent with rodent studies showing that lesions to the dACC result in alterations in EBDM, including a preference for low reward, low effort options and primate and human studies showing that activating the dACC increases the will to persevere when faced with high effort demands, particularly when they offer the possibility of a higher reward (Blanchard et al., 2015; Fetcho et al., 2024; Holec et al., 2014; Johnston et al., 2007; Parvizi et al., 2013; Schweimer et al., 2005). One fiber photometry study in rodents recorded activity in the dACC and NAcc during EBDM and showed that activity of the dACC-NAcc circuit, but not other dACC projections, was modulated by effort demands during reward seeking (Fetcho et al., 2024). Moreover, they found that supressing dACC-NAcc activity during reward seeking reduced the choice to pursue high effort, high reward options, suggesting that the dACC-NAcc circuit might be involved in guiding decisions to continue engaging in effort for higher rewards and computing decision confidence that provides animals with feedback on their ability to overcome effort demands to obtain rewards (Fetcho et al., 2024). A human EBDM fMRI study also found that blocks requiring high effort elicited greater activity in the dACC compared to low effort blocks (Botvinick et al., 2009). In contrast, NAcc activity was associated with reward cues and NAcc activity was reduced after high compared to low effort blocks (i.e., when effort expenditure was high, subsequent rewards were valued less), suggesting that dACC signals task demands and dynamically modulates reward valuation in the NAcc (Botvinick et al., 2009). These findings align with the present results showing reduced rsFC between the dACC and NAcc associated with higher bias, perhaps due to weakened integration of effort costs and reward valuation, resulting in higher reward thresholds needed to engage in effortful behavior.

Despite the valuable insights gained from this study, some limitations warrant consideration. First, the sample was primarily composed of female, Caucasian, and highly educated older adults from Quebec, Canada with a family history of AD, all of whom were recruited from a longitudinal research cohort designed to prevent AD. Consequently, this sample may represent a particularly research-engaged and socially motivated group, potentially exhibiting elevated prosocial tendencies relative to the general older adult population. Therefore, the generalizability of the current findings to broader and more diverse populations of older adults should be investigated in future research. Second, the within-subjects task design may have increased the likelihood of a social desirability bias, as knowledge of each condition might have increased participants' tendencies to act in ways consistent with perceived social norms. Future studies should consider employing between-subjects designs to minimize such expectancy effects. Additionally, because the current study included only older adults, it remains unclear how these findings compare to younger adults, who have shown reduced prosocial motivation in prior research (Crawford et al., 2023l; Lockwood et al., 2021; Livingstone & Isaacowitz. 2021; Luong et al., 2011; Radjenovic et al., 2024). Directly comparing performance of younger and older adults on the task would help clarify how prosocial EBDM evolves across the lifespan and whether these findings are specific to older adults. Third, all rewards in the present paradigm were monetary, though many real-world prosocial behaviors (e.g., caregiving, volunteering, emotional support) may be intrinsically rewarding but lack financial incentive. Future studies should examine whether similar or different neural and behavioral patterns emerge when at risk older adults engage in non-monetary prosocial acts. Finally, while this study used rsFC to characterize intrinsic functional connectivity patterns underlying prosocial EBDM, task-based

fMRI designs could complement these findings by identifying dynamic connectivity patterns during decision-making itself. Finally, while the current study identified behavioral and rsFC differences between APOE4 carriers and non-carriers, potential neuropathological mechanisms underlying these differences warrant future investigation. For example, future studies could investigate whether elevations in in tumor necrosis factor alpha and amyloid beta or reductions in brain-derived neurotrophic factor in APOE4 carriers mediates any alterations in EBDM or rsFC of reward circuitry (Alvarez et al., 2014; Kanekiyo et al., 2014; Sasayama et al., 2020).

In summary, this study provides novel evidence that older adults at risk for AD demonstrate heightened motivation to exert effort for prosocial relative to self-oriented rewards, with this prosocial preference associated with rsFC to the vmPFC and ACCg. Moreover, reduced rsFC within a reward circuit (dACC–NAc) among APOE4 carriers suggests that subtle alterations in motivational circuitry may precede self-reported cognitive decline, highlighting potential early neural markers of altered goal-directed behavior and decision making. From a translational perspective, these findings underscore the potential of prosocial incentives to enhance physical effort in older adults at risk for AD. Namely, prosocial incentives can potentially maintain the willingness to expend high physical effort. For APOE4 carriers, higher reward values are required to accept effort for both types of reward, but vigor is heightened for prosocial compared to self-oriented rewards, suggesting that baseline motivational drive and action energization may be differentially affected in APOE4 carriers, and that prosocial rewards may be particularly effective at energizing action in this population. Engaging in prosocial behaviors such as volunteering, caregiving, and charitable giving has been shown to enhance purpose in life, social connectedness, and emotional well-being, while reducing loneliness, depressive symptoms, and even mortality risk (Isaacowitz et al., 2021). Such behaviors are also associated with greater cognitive resilience and reduced dementia risk (Han et al., 2020; Ibanez et al., 2023). Designing interventions that harness prosocial motivational incentives and neural targets 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 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 for her valuable input. 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=. We would also like to thank Margie Lachman for her leadership of the Boston Roybal Centre, and to Annie Le Bire and Joanna Masterlick for administrative support.

# 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


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. doi:10.1037//0278-6133.19.6.586

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. doi:10.3233/JAD-140849

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. Published 2024 Oct 16. doi:10.1002/dad2.70013

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. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.02.063

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

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. Published 2011 Oct 2. doi:10.1038/nn.2933

Blanchard TC, Strait CE, Hayden BY. Ramping ensemble activity in dorsal anterior cingulate neurons during persistent commitment to a decision. *J Neurophysiol*. 2015;114(4):2439-2449. doi:10.1152/jn.00711.2015

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. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3022-12.2013

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

Botvinick MM, Huffstetler S, McGuire JT. Effort discounting in human nucleus accumbens. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci*. 2009;9(1):16-27. doi:10.3758/CABN.9.1.16

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. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117656

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. doi:10.1073/pnas.1109038108

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. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbz136

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. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbac194

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. Published 2023 Dec 1. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.46789

Bzdok D, Langner R, Schilbach L, et al. Segregation of the human medial prefrontal cortex in social cognition. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2013;7:232. Published 2013 May 29. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00232

Carstensen LL, Isaacowitz DM, Charles ST. Taking time seriously. A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *Am Psychol*. 1999;54(3):165-181. doi:10.1037//0003-066x.54.3.165

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. doi:10.1093/brain/awy219

Chang SW, Gariépy JF, Platt ML. Neuronal reference frames for social decisions in primate frontal cortex. *Nat Neurosci*. 2013;16(2):243-250. doi:10.1038/nn.3287

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. doi:10.1037/pag0000460

Clairis N, Pessiglione M. Value Estimation versus Effort Mobilization: A General Dissociation between Ventromedial and Dorsomedial Prefrontal Cortex. *J Neurosci*. 2024;44(17):e1176232024. Published 2024 Apr 24. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1176-23.2024

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. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2019.10.013

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. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbac167

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. doi:10.1038/s43587-021-00118-3

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. doi:10.3928/19404921-20170831-05

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

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. doi:10.1002/hbm.20127

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. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2006.01.021

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. doi:10.1002/hbm.24912

Dilcher, R., Malpas, C. B., O'Brien, T. J., & Vivash, L. (2023). Social Cognition in Behavioral Variant Frontotemporal Dementia and Pathological Subtypes: A Narrative Review. *Journal of Alzheimer's disease, 94*(1), 19–38. https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-221171

D'Onofrio G, Panza F, Seripa D, et al. The APOE polymorphism in Alzheimer's disease patients with neuropsychiatric symptoms and syndromes. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2011;26(10):1062-1070. doi:10.1002/gps.2644

DuPre, E. M., Salo, T., Ahmed, Z., Bandettini, P. A., Bottenhorn, K. L., Caballero-Gaudes, C., Dowdle, L. T., Gonzalez-Castillo, J., Heunis, S., Kundu, P., Laird, A. R., Markello, R., Markiewicz, C. J., Moia, S., Staden, I., Teves, J. B., Uruñuela, E., Vaziri-Pashkam, M., Whitaker, K., & Handwerker, D. A. (2021). TE-dependent analysis of multi-echo fMRI with tedana. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *6(66)*, 3669. doi:10.21105/joss.03669.

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. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhu250

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. doi:10.1093/cercor/bht196

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. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2023.10.020

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. doi:10.1093/scan/nsu001

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. Published 2021 Jan 4. doi:10.1186/s13195-020-00740-0

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. Published 2024 Oct 1. doi:10.1162/netn_a_00385

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. doi:10.1016/s0042-6989(01)00073-6

Gueguen M, Cutler J, Drew D, et al. Ventromedial prefrontal cortex lesions disrupt learning to reward others. *Brain*. 2025;148(10):3537-3550. doi:10.1093/brain/awaf056

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. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2020.112970

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. doi:10.1111/ejn.13608

Hauber W, Sommer S. Prefrontostriatal circuitry regulates effort-related decision making. *Cereb Cortex*. 2009;19(10):2240-2247. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhn241

Hays CC, Zlatar ZZ, Meloy MJ, et al. Anterior Cingulate Structure and Perfusion is Associated with Cerebrospinal Fluid Tau among Cognitively Normal Older Adult APOEε4 Carriers. *J Alzheimers Dis*. 2020;73(1):87-101. doi:10.3233/JAD-190504

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. doi:10.1037/pag0000127

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. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.10.030

Holec V, Pirot HL, Euston DR. Not all effort is equal: the role of the anterior cingulate cortex in different forms of effort-reward decisions. *Front Behav Neurosci*. 2014;8:12. Published 2014 Jan 28. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00012

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. Published 2022 Aug 22. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-18325-2

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

Ibanez A, Matallana D, Miller B. Can prosocial values improve brain health?. *Front Neurol*. 2023;14:1202173. Published 2023 Jun 5. doi:10.3389/fneur.2023.1202173

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. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbab032

Jimenez CA, Meyer ML. The dorsomedial prefrontal cortex prioritizes social learning during rest. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2024;121(12):e2309232121. doi:10.1073/pnas.2309232121

Johnston K, Levin HM, Koval MJ, Everling S. Top-down control-signal dynamics in anterior cingulate and prefrontal cortex neurons following task switching. *Neuron*. 2007;53(3):453-462. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2006.12.023

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. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-21449-z

Kanekiyo T, Xu H, Bu G. ApoE and Aβ in Alzheimer's disease: accidental encounters or partners?. *Neuron*. 2014;81(4):740-754. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2014.01.045

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. doi:10.1073/pnas.1805573115

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. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2011.01.073

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. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2668-09.2009

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. doi:10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x

Kundu P, Brenowitz ND, Voon V, et al. Integrated strategy for improving functional connectivity mapping using multiecho fMRI. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2013;110(40):16187-16192. doi:10.1073/pnas.1301725110

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. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.12.028

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. doi:10.1007/s00429-017-1576-y

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. doi:10.1007/s11682-024-00911-9

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. doi:10.1093/brain/awy110

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. doi:10.1093/geront/gnae082

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. doi:10.1037/pag0000873

Livingstone KM, Isaacowitz DM. Age and emotion regulation in daily life: Frequency, strategies, tactics, and effectiveness. *Emotion*. 2021;21(1):39-51. doi:10.1037/emo0000672

Lockwood PL, Abdurahman A, Gabay AS, et al. Aging Increases Prosocial Motivation for Effort. *Psychol Sci*. 2021;32(5):668-681. doi:10.1177/0956797620975781

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. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1703-15.2015

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. doi:10.1038/s41562-024-01899-4

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. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2022.08.010

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. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2025.121509

Luong G, Charles ST, Fingerman KL. Better With Age: Social Relationships Across Adulthood. *J Soc Pers Relat*. 2011;28(1):9-23. doi:10.1177/0265407510391362

Marin RS, Biedrzycki RC, Firinciogullari S. Reliability and validity of the Apathy Evaluation Scale. *Psychiatry Res*. 1991;38(2):143-162. doi:10.1016/0165-1781(91)90040-v

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. doi:10.1177/14713012231156976

Mehak SF, Shivakumar AB, Saraf V, Johansson M, Gangadharan G. Apathy in Alzheimer's disease: A neurocircuitry based perspective. *Ageing Res Rev*. 2023;87:101891. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2023.101891

Mikels JA, Taullahu DB. Emotion, Aging, and Decision Making: A State of the Art Mini-Review. *Adv Geriatr Med Res*. 2023;5(1):e230003. doi:10.20900/agmr20230003

Morese R, Brasso C, Stanziano M, et al. Efforts for the Correct Comprehension of Deceitful and Ironic Communicative Intentions in Schizophrenia: A Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging Study on the Role of the Left Middle Temporal Gyrus. *Front Psychol*. 2022;13:866160. Published 2022 Jun 14. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.866160

Moretti L, Dragone D, di Pellegrino G. Reward and social valuation deficits following ventromedial prefrontal damage. *J Cogn Neurosci*. 2009;21(1):128-140. doi:10.1162/jocn.2009.21011

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. doi:10.1002/hbm.25822

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. doi: 10.1093/brain/awaf393

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. Published 2020 May 19. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0232949

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. Published 2014 Jul 23. doi:10.1038/ncomms5390

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. doi:10.1037/pag0000827

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. doi:10.1017/S1041610207006655

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. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2018.03.025

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. doi:10.1093/brain/awm052

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. doi:10.1002/alz.14304

Pantazatos SP, Yanagihara TK, Zhang X, Meitzler T, Hirsch J. Frontal-occipital connectivity during visual search. *Brain Connect*. 2012;2(3):164-175. doi:10.1089/brain.2012.0072

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. doi:10.1016/j.arr.2011.06.005

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. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2013.10.057

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. Published 2025 Apr 14. doi:10.1038/s41598-025-96656-6

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. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbae144

Rahal RM, Fiedler S. Cognitive and affective processes of prosociality. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2022;44:309-314. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.10.007

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. doi:10.1076/jcen.20.3.310.823

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. Published 2022 Nov 8. doi:10.1186/s13024-022-00574-4

Rolls ET, Deco G, Huang CC, Feng J. The human orbitofrontal cortex, vmPFC, and anterior cingulate cortex effective connectome: emotion, memory, and action. *Cereb Cortex*. 2022;33(2):330-356. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhac070

Roy M, Shohamy D, Wager TD. Ventromedial prefrontal-subcortical systems and the generation of affective meaning. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2012;16(3):147-156. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2012.01.005

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. Published 2022 Nov 10. doi:10.3389/fnana.2022.1035420

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. Published 2020 Aug 20. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003289

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. doi:10.1002/npr2.12110

Scheibe S, Carstensen LL. Emotional aging: recent findings and future trends. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2010;65B(2):135-144. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbp132

Schweimer J, Hauber W. Involvement of the rat anterior cingulate cortex in control of instrumental responses guided by reward expectancy. *Learn Mem*. 2005;12(3):334-342. doi:10.1101/lm.90605

Sideridis G, Alahmadi MTS. The Role of Response Times on the Measurement of Mental Ability. *Front Psychol*. 2022;13:892317. Published 2022 Jun 17. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.892317

Simon Iv J, Rich EL. Neural populations in macaque anterior cingulate cortex encode social image identities. *Nat Commun*. 2024;15(1):7500. Published 2024 Aug 29. doi:10.1038/s41467-024-51825-5

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. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2016.05.020

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.

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. Published 2024 Apr 10. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1596-23.2024

Sun W, Matsuoka T, Narumoto J. Decision-Making Support for People With Alzheimer's Disease: A Narrative Review. *Front Psychol*. 2021;12:750803. Published 2021 Nov 12. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.750803

Talbot J, Cutler J, Tamm M, et al. Dopamine boosts motivation for prosocial effort in Parkinson's disease. *J Neurosci*. Published online January 2, 2025. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1593-24.2024

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. doi:10.1038/s41380-020-0688-6

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. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2019.09.011

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. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.6459-11.2012

Treadway MT, Buckholtz JW, Schwartzman AN, Lambert WE, Zald DH. Worth the 'EEfRT'? The effort expenditure for rewards task as an objective measure of motivation and anhedonia. *PLoS One*. 2009;4(8):e6598. Published 2009 Aug 12. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0006598

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. doi:10.1007/s00429-021-02231-w

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. doi:10.1002/hbm.20531

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. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1821-09.2009

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. doi:10.1101/2025.07.22.25331791

Wagner DD, Kelley WM, Haxby JV, Heatherton TF. The Dorsal Medial Prefrontal Cortex Responds Preferentially to Social Interactions during Natural Viewing. *J Neurosci*. 2016;36(26):6917-6925. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4220-15.2016

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. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbae060

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. doi:10.1016/j.tjpad.2024.100039

Wang J, Yang Y, Fan L, et al. Convergent functional architecture of the superior parietal lobule unraveled with multimodal neuroimaging approaches. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 2015;36(1):238-257. doi:10.1002/hbm.22626

Wang J, Yang Z, Klugah-Brown B, et al. The critical mediating roles of the middle temporal gyrus and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex in the dynamic processing of interpersonal emotion regulation. *Neuroimage*. 2024;300:120789. doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2024.120789

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. Published 2021 Mar 10. doi:10.7554/eLife.63166

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. Published 2024 Jun 3. doi:10.1038/s41467-024-48490-z

Whitfield-Gabrieli S, Nieto-Castanon A. Conn: a functional connectivity toolbox for correlated and anticorrelated brain networks. *Brain Connect*. 2012;2(3):125-141. doi:10.1089/brain.2012.0073

Whitney C, Kirk M, O'Sullivan J, Lambon Ralph MA, Jefferies E. The neural organization of semantic control: TMS evidence for a distributed network in left inferior frontal and posterior middle temporal gyrus. *Cereb Cortex*. 2011;21(5):1066-1075. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhq180

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. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4317-12.2013

Zanini A, Dureux A, Selvanayagam J, Everling S. Ultra-high field fMRI identifies an action-observation network in the common marmoset. *Commun Biol*. 2023;6(1):553. Published 2023 May 22. doi:10.1038/s42003-023-04942-8

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. Published 2021 Sep 20. doi:10.3389/fnagi.2021.736201

Zimmermann J, Alain C, Butler C. Impaired memory-guided attention in asymptomatic APOE4 carriers. *Sci Rep*. 2019;9(1):8138. Published 2019 May 31. doi:10.1038/s41598-019-44471-1

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. Published 2025 Mar 7. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1451590