

Supplementary Materials

Methods

Experimental Procedure

Functional localizer day

⇒ *outside the scanner*

1. Questionnaire Battery: Participants completed a battery of questionnaires, including the Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI)¹, Rumination Response Scale (RRS)^{2,3}, and Trait Anxiety Scale (STAI-Y2)⁴.

⇒ *inside the scanner*

2. Resting-state fMRI: Participants were instructed to focus on a central fixation and relax. Scanning took ten minutes.
3. T1-weighted structural MRI: Participants were again instructed to focus on a central fixation and relax. Scanning took nine minutes and fifty seconds.
4. N-back task. Over 24 blocks (split into three sessions), participants saw a series of serially presented numbers with intermittent rest periods. Depending on the block, participants were instructed to press a button either each time they saw a number (“0-back”) or each time the presented number was the same as the number presented one, two, or three numbers ago (“1-back”, “2-back”, and “3-back”, respectively). Recruitment of the Executive Control Network is expected to increase with task difficulty (i.e. 3-back>2-back>1-back>0-back) (Thompson et al., 2016). Conversely, recruitment of the Default Mode Network is expected to be highest during rest periods (Raichle et al., 2001). We thus used this task to localize peak DLPFC/mFG activity for each participant under conditions of expected high Executive Control Network recruitment and to localize peak PCC/precuneus activity for each participant under conditions of expected high Default Mode Network recruitment. These individualized localizations were then used to build individualized regions of interest for each participant (specific analysis details in Taylor et al., 2022⁵). The total scanning time for this task was 18 minutes and 39 seconds.

Day 0

⇒ *inside the scanner*

1. SHAM task (Figure. 1, see Taylor et al. 2022⁵ for more details): participants did the FCNef task with random feedback (rather than feedback based on their neural activity). The purpose was to get, for each participant, a baseline level of functional connectivity between the two target ROIs (DLPFC-PCC) with which we could compare their functional connectivity from the FCNef task. Importantly, participants did not know that

Supplementary: FCNef for Precision Medicine.

the feedback was random- they had been instructed that the feedback depended on their neural activity from during the induction period of the task.

2. Resting-state fMRI

⇒ *outside the scanner.*

3. Questionnaire Battery.

FCNef days 1-4

⇒ *inside the scanner*

1. FCNef task (Figure 1, see Taylor et al. 2022⁵ for more details): On Day 1, participants received an apology and an explanation that the feedback on the previous day had been random but that it would be real henceforth. On all days of the FCNef task (Days 1-4), participants were instructed that the feedback would be based on their neural activity from during the induction period of the task and, importantly, it really was. The participants were given no clue as to what specific neural activity this feedback was based on but in reality it was based on the functional connectivity between the targeted regions of interest. The specific details of the feedback calculation are detailed below in the section entitled 'FCNef and SHAM score calculation'. This feedback corresponded to a real monetary reward bonus (which differed between conditions and is described in detail in the section in the main text entitled "Differences in Experimental Procedure").
2. Resting-state fMRI: Same as above.

⇒ *participants excited the scanner.*

3. Questionnaire Battery (only on FCNef Day 4): Same as above.

Follow-up (Post) testing (one and two months after FCNef)

⇒ *participants entered the scanner.*

1. Resting-state fMRI: same as above.

⇒ *participants excited the scanner.*

2. Questionnaire Battery: same as above.

Participants

Participant screening and recruitment

Participants were first screened and then, when appropriate, recruited for the main experiment. Recruitment for screening was done in various ways, such as via leaflets in the post, poster advertisements in major local railway stations and universities, online job-seeking websites, and by word-of-mouth. Our only limitations for screening were that participants must be within the specified age range of 20-40 years old and must speak Japanese. Screening took place over two days, with at least one week between the two. On each screening day, participants completed the Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI) questionnaire¹. Participants were deemed as potentially able to participate in the main experiment if (a) they had a mean BDI score of 8 or over, averaged over the two days of screening, and (b) if they indicated no intention for suicide on the relevant BDI question. Participants who met these criteria next talked

with a medical doctor or clinical psychologist, who determined whether or not they currently had a diagnosis or were receiving treatment for a psychiatric illness. Such participants were excluded due to ethical considerations as we did not yet know the full extent of short and long-term effects of the FCNef manipulation under the range of conditions used in this study. Otherwise, the participant was invited back for the main experiment. Of the participants who eventually took part in the main experiment (described below), their average BDI score over the two screening measurements was 14.33 (std = 5.26), which puts them generally in the category of “mild depression”¹ and we therefore consider them “subclinical”.

Participant demographic information

In total, we here report the data of 68 participants, 19 of whom have had their data reported previously. Including the data of these 19 participants here allows us better to explore contrasts between our three parameters of interest. These 68 participants had a mean age of 25.94 (std = 6.67), and 32 identified as female. All had normal or corrected-to-normal vision.

Participant payment

For each questionnaire session (including screening sessions), participants were paid ¥3000. They were paid a base reward of ¥8000 for each MRI session. In SHAM and FCNef sessions, they also received a reward bonus, as described in the main text.

Materials

The protocol was the same as reported in Taylor et al. (2022)⁵. We quote the relevant part of that publication: *Visual stimulus presentation was controlled using MATLAB 7.5.0.342 (2007b; The MathWorks Inc.). The visual stimuli were projected to an opaque screen inside the scanner via a projector (DLA-X7-B, JVC; frame rate = 60 Hz) and a mirror system. Participants responded to the stimuli using MRI-compatible response pads (HHSC-2 × 2, Current Designs, Inc., PA, USA).*

Self-report symptom questionnaires

Beck Depression Inventory-II (BDI)

The BDI comprises 21 items rated on a four-point scale from 0 to 3. Higher scores of BDI indicate greater severity of general depressive symptoms. Reliability and validity have been confirmed¹.

Rumination Response Scale (RRS)

The RRS comprises 22 items rated on a four-point scale from 1 (never) to 4 (almost always). It measures rumination symptoms; i.e., symptoms related to repeated self-reflection about negative emotions. For analysis, we used only the brooding subscale of this questionnaire. This consists of 5 items related to the maladaptive form of rumination (“moody pondering”) when this is unconfounded with general depressive symptoms². Reliability and validity have been confirmed.^{2,3}

Supplementary: FCNef for Precision Medicine.

State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)

The STAI comprises 40 items rated on a four-point scale from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much), which measures general anxiety symptoms. For analysis, we used only the trait anxiety subscale of this questionnaire (STAI-Y2), which comprises 20 of these items. Reliability and validity have been confirmed.⁴

Imaging data acquisition

A 3T MR scanner with a 32-channel head coil, located at the ATR Brain Activity Imaging Center, was used for data acquisition (Siemens MAGNETOM Verio, Siemens, Erlangen, Germany). Anatomical images were acquired using a T1-weighted MP-RAGE protocol (slice number, 240; matrix size, 256 * 256; FOV, 256 mm; voxel size, 1.0 * 1.0 * 1.0 mm (no slice gap); TR, 2300 ms; TE, 2.98 ms; flip angle, 9°). T2*-weighted images reflecting blood oxygen level-dependent (BOLD) signals were acquired in all experimental and resting-state sessions using gradient-echo echo-planar imaging (EPI) (slice number, 60; matrix size, 100 * 100; FOV, 200 mm; voxel size, 2.0 * 2.0 * 2.0 mm (0.5mm slice gap); TR, 1000 ms; TE, 28 ms; flip angle, 65°). Multiband sequence, with an acceleration factor of 6, allowed for faster slice acquisition⁶⁻⁸. Each 'functional localizer task' session took 590s and consisted of 590 volumes. Each SHAM FCNef and FCNef session took 512s and consisted of 512 volumes. Each resting-state session took 600s and consisted of 600 volumes. The first ten volumes taken in each session of all experimental and resting-state sessions were discarded to ensure steady-state magnetization.

FCNef and SHAM score calculation

All participants received a baseline reward bonus of ¥500 on each day for the SHAM and FCNef tasks. On each day of FCNef (but not on the SHAM day), they could get an additional reward bonus- this depended on their average FCNef scores from that day. FCNef scores were calculated based on the targeted functional connection from the induction period of each trial. If this was the same as the participant's mean baseline functional connectivity (that from their SHAM task on Day 0) then the FCNef score on that trial would be 50; if this was more anticorrelated than the participant's mean baseline functional connectivity, then the FCNef score on that trial would be higher than 50, up to a score of 100 (which was calculated as the mean baseline FC - the std baseline FC). This is because we wished to reinforce more negative connectivity. On the contrary, if the FC was more positively correlated than the participant's mean baseline functional connectivity, then the FCNef score on that trial would be lower than 50, down to a score of 0 (which was calculated as the mean baseline FC + the std of baseline FC). All task scores were presented as a green feedback circle on screen, whose maximum circumference corresponded to a score of 100 and whose minimum circumference corresponded to a score of 0 (Figure 2). Note that SHAM scores (scores from the SHAM task on Day 0) were random (see⁵) and not used to calculate reward.

Supplementary Table 1. An example of the different reward bonus payments given for different average daily FCNef scores, depending on the (low/high) reward schedule condition.

FCNef Score	Low Reward Bonus	High Reward Bonus
50	¥500	¥500
60	¥500	¥1000
70	¥500	¥1500
80	¥1000	¥2000
90	¥2000	¥2500
100	¥3000	¥3000

Supplementary Results

Pilot study/analysis investigating induction time-window

FCNef data from the 40s induction time-window of 15 participants who were run in preliminary versions of our FCNef for depression paradigm (with high reward) was re-analyzed. As in all versions of this design to date, participants were reinforced during FCNef when they made their DLPFC-PCC FC more negative than their baseline FC (which was calculated from SHAM data). We wished to examine how “effectively” the participants were using the 40s time-window and so we analyzed different “time intervals” from within this. Here we show results for the following time-intervals: 0-10s, 10-20s, 20-30s, and 20-40s. The DLPFC-PCC FC was calculated (in the same method as during online FCNef, described in Taylor et al., 2022⁵) for each of these time-intervals. This was put into a LME as the dependent variable. Independent variables of “TI” (Time Interval: 0-10s, 10-20s, 20-30s, and 20-40) and “Day” (FCNef Day 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4) were included in the model. A model which included additive effects of these variables (‘FC~Day+TI’; AIC=-229.10) was not significantly improved by including the interaction between them (‘FC~Day*TI’; AIC=-229.87) ($\chi^2(1) = 2.77, p = 0.100$). It was improved by adding a random intercept for experimental subject (‘FC~Day+TI+(1|Subject)’; AIC=-266.01) ($\chi^2(1) = 38.91, p < 0.001$). This best-fit model had a significant main effect of Day and a significant main effect of TI (see Supplementary Table 2, below). These results reflect the fact that overall average DLPFC-PCC FCs changed over days of FCNef and that they were different for the different TIs. As can be seen on Supplementary Figure 1 (below), in line with successful FCNef, participants’ DLPFC-PCC FCs became more negative over FCNef days. Interestingly, as is most apparent in the results for FCNef Days 3 and 4 (reflecting an effect of learning), these

Supplementary: FCNef for Precision Medicine.


DLPF-PCC FCs were more negative in the 0-10s and 10-20s TIs than they were in the 20-30s and 30-40s TIs. Because the goal was to make DLPF-PCC FCs more negative, we therefore concluded that the participants learned to most effectively do this in the first 20s of the 40s induction time-window. When we compared the DLPF-PCC FCs on each day of FCNef as analyzed from a full 20s time-window (from 0-20s) compared to the full 40s time-window (from 0-40s) we found no significant differences (uncorrected p s >0.05; bear in mind that the data from the 0-20s time-window is also included in the 0-40s time-window). Overall, therefore, it seems that participants most effectively used the first 20s of the 40s time-window and that DLPF-PCC FCs did not change depending on whether a 20s or 40s time-window was used for analysis. The results of this analysis were our basis for testing of 20s versus 40s induction time-windows experimentally, as reported in this paper.

Supplementary Table 2. Best-fit LME to predict average online DLPFC-PCC FCNef from pilot data

Model: FC~ TI+Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: FC= linear, TI = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-0.1801	0.0303	-5.9491	297	0	-0.2397	-0.1205
TI	0.0023	0.0008	3.0519	297	0.0025	0.0008	0.0038
Day	-0.0491	0.006	-8.2262	297	0	-0.0608	-0.0373



Supplementary Figure 1: DLPFC-PCC Functional Connectivity (FC) from different “time intervals” (TIs) of a 40s induction time-window. LPF-PCC FCs in all TIs become more negative over the days of FCNef training. FCs were particularly more negative in the 0-10s and 10-20s TIs on Days 3 and 4. D = Day. FC = functional connectivity between the DLPFC and PCC.

FCNef scores: detailed analysis

Induction time-window x reward schedule (Dataset 1)

Using the data from Dataset 1, the best fit-model to predict the dependent variable of **average** FCNef score ($Score \sim Day * TW * Reward + (1 | Subject)$) (Supplementary Table 2) showed a significant interaction between Day, Time Window (TW), and Reward (Supplementary Table 3). To examine exactly where the effect(s) of this 3-way interaction lay, we split this LME by Reward and re-ran it for the high and low reward conditions separately (minus the regressor for Reward and its interactions: $Score \sim Day * TW + (1 | Subject)$). The LME for the high reward condition revealed a significant main effect of Day, which was superseded by a significant interaction between Day and TW (Supplementary Table 4). When a paired sample t-test was used to compare the FCNef scores from Day 1 and Day 4, these were found to be significantly higher on Day 4 for participants in the high reward condition with the 40s TW ($t(8) = -4.37$, $p_{FDR} = 0.004$). When the same comparison was run for participants in the high reward condition with

the 20s TW, results were found to be in the same direction but did not reach significance ($t(11) = -1.04$, $p_{FDR} = 0.160$). The LME for the low reward condition (specifically, the “Consec/Low Rew” group, whose data is also in dataset 2, see Table 3) revealed a significant main effect of TW (Supplementary Table 4). A follow-up independent-samples t-test revealed that there were overall higher average scores for the participants within this group who were run with the 20s TW condition (57.52 ± 15.05) than for participants who were run with the 40s TW condition (44.32 ± 8.28) ($t(21) = 2.49$, $p = 0.021$).

Results from analyses to predict FCNef score **variance** mirrored those reported above for average FCNef score; The same best-fit model was found (but with a dependent variable of FCNef score **variance**) and, within this model, the same 3-way interaction was found (See Supplementary Tables 6 and 7). Identical analyses to examine where the effects lay were run and these revealed mirroring results for the high reward condition (see Supplementary Table 8). When paired sample t-tests were used to compare variance in the FCNef scores from Day 1 and Day 4, it was found to be significantly lower on Day 4 for participants in the high reward condition with the 40s TW ($t(8) = 5.12$, $p_{FDR} = 0.002$). When the same comparison was run for participants in the high reward condition with the 20s TW, results were found to be in the same direction but did not reach significance ($t(11) = 0.23$, $p_{FDR} = 0.412$). Follow-up analyses showed nothing of significance in the low reward condition (See Supplementary Table 8).

Induction time-window x experimental schedule (Dataset 2)

Using the data from Dataset 2, the best fit-model to predict the dependent variable of **average** FCNef score ($\text{Score} \sim \text{TW} * \text{ES} + \text{Day} + (1 | \text{Subject})$) (see Supplementary Table 2) showed a trend for a main effect of Day (See Supplementary Table 5). It also showed a significant interaction between TW and Experimental Schedule (ES) (See Supplementary Table 5). We therefore split the data by ES (consecutive/non-consecutive) and ran follow-up t-tests to examine differences between 20s and 40s time-window conditions. The results for the **consecutive** condition showed significantly higher average scores for the participants within this group who were run with the 20s compared to the 40s TW condition (this is the “Consec/Low Rew” group whose data is in both datasets so these t-test results are shown above; but here the $p_{FDR} = 0.041$). On the contrary, the results for the **non-consecutive** condition were in the other direction, but not significantly so ($t(19) = -0.74$, $p_{FDR} = 0.469$).

The best fit-model to predict the dependent variable of FCNef score **variance** for Dataset 2 ($\text{Score} \sim \text{Day} + (1 | \text{Subject})$) (see Supplementary Table 6) showed no significant main effects (see Supplementary Table 9).

Supplementary Table 3: LMEs to predict **average** FCNef scores for both datasets

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'Score ~ Day'	1512	-752.98	'Score ~ Day'	1465.8	-729.9
2	'Score ~ Day+ TW+Reward'	1509.9	-749.95*	'Score ~ Day+T W+ES'	1463.1	-726.56*
3	'Score ~ Day* TW+Reward'	1509.3	748.63	'Score ~ Day* TW+ES'	1465.0	-726.52
	'Score ~ TW* Reward+Day'	1464.9	-726.44***	'Score ~ TW* ES+Day'	1448.7	-718.33***
	'Score ~ Day* Reward+TW'	1510.5	-749.26	'Score ~ Day* ES+TW'	1465.1	-726.54
4	'Score ~ Day* TW*Reward'	1462.5	-722.26*	'Score ~ Day* TW*ES'	1454.1	-718.06
5	'Score ~ Day* TW*Reward+ (1 Subject)'	1401.4	-690.72***	'Score ~TW* ES+Day+ (1 Subject)'	1397.4	-691.7***

Supplementary Table 4. Best-fit LME to predict average FCNef scores for Dataset 1

Model: Score ~ Day*TW*Reward+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: Score = linear, Day = linear, TW = linear, Reward = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	70.0365	10.3522	6.7654	168	0	49.5993	90.473
Day	0.268	2.8002	0.0957	168	0.9239	-5.2602	5.7962
Reward	-24.12	14.9666	-1.6116	168	0.1089	-53.6668	5.4268
TW	-0.7178	0.341	-2.1051	168	0.0368	-1.3909	0.0446
Day:Reward	-7.2545	4.0484	-1.7919	168	0.0749	-15.2468	0.7379
Day:TW	0.0233	0.0922	0.2526	168	0.8009	-0.1588	0.2054
Reward:TW	0.8062	0.494	1.6319	168	0.1046	-0.1691	1.7815
Day:Reward:TW	0.349	0.1336	2.612	168	0.0098	0.0852	0.6128

Supplementary Table 5. LME from Supplementary Table 3 split by Reward

Model: Score ~ Day*TW+(1|Subject)

(separately for data from low/high reward conditions)

Main factor variables: Score = linear, Day = linear, TW = linear

High Reward							
Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	45.9165	11.2707	4.074	80	0.0001	23.4871	68.3459
Day	-6.9865	3.2195	-2.1701	80	0.033	-13.3934	-0.5795
TW	0.0884	0.3727	0.2372	80	0.8131	-0.6534	0.8302
Day:TW	0.3723	0.1065	3.497	80	0.0008	0.1604	0.5842
Low Reward							
Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	70.0365	9.9311	7.0522	88	0	50.3006	89.7725
Day	0.268	2.5139	0.1066	88	0.9153	-4.7279	5.2639
TW	-0.7178	0.3271	-2.1943	88	0.0308	-1.3679	-0.0677
Day:TW	0.0233	0.0828	0.2814	88	0.7791	-0.1413	0.1879

Supplementary Table 6. Best-fit LME to predict average FCNef scores for Dataset 2

Model: Score ~ TW*ES+Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: Score = linear, TW = linear, ES = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	48.6935	3.5863	13.5776	174	0	41.6153	55.7718
Day	1.0928	0.6311	1.7315	174	0.0851	-0.1528	2.3385
ES	-7.1008	4.6409	-1.5301	174	0.1278	-16.2604	2.0589
TW	-3.6127	4.5293	-0.7976	174	0.4262	-12.5522	5.3268
ES:TW	16.8036	6.3577	2.643	174	0.009	4.2554	29.3517

Supplementary Table 7: LMEs to predict variance in FCNef scores for both datasets

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'Std Score ~ Day'	1119.6	-556.82	'Std Score ~ Day ,	1044.1	-519.06
2	'Std Score ~ Day+ TW+Reward'	1113.5	-551.76**	'Std Score ~ Day + TW+ES'	1046.5	-518.26
3	'Std Score ~ Day* TW+Reward'	1111.0	-549.51*	'Std Score ~ Day * TW+ES'	1046.1	-517.03
	'Std Score ~ TW* Reward+Day'	1100.7	-544.33***	'Std Score ~ TW* ES+Day'	1048.0	-518.00
	'Std Score ~ Day* Reward+TW'	1114.0	-550.99	'Std Score ~ Day * ES+TW'	1045.5	-516.73
4	'Std Score ~ Day* TW*Reward'	1090.6	-536.28**	'Std Score ~ Day * TW*ES'	1048.2	-515.08
5	'Std Score ~ Day* TW*Reward+ (1 Subject)'	1075.8	-527.89***	'Std Score ~ Day + (1 Subject)'	1016.40	-504.18***

Supplementary Table 8. Best-fit LME to predict variance in FCNef scores for Dataset 1

Model: Std Score ~ Day*TW*Reward+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: Score = linear, Day = linear, TW = linear, Reward = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	39.2248	3.7918	10.3447	168	0	31.7391	46.7105
Day	-1.4585	1.2324	-1.1834	168	0.2383	-3.8915	0.9746
Reward	-5.6948	5.4819	-1.0388	168	0.3004	-16.5171	5.1275
TW	-0.0115	0.1249	-0.0923	168	0.9266	-0.2581	0.235
Day:Reward	5.2538	1.7817	2.9487	168	0.0036	1.7363	8.7713
Day:TW	0.0231	0.0406	0.5682	168	0.5706	-0.0571	0.1032
Reward:TW	0.2208	0.1809	1.2204	168	0.224	-0.1364	0.578
Day:Reward:TW	-0.2163	0.0588	-3.6775	168	0.0003	-0.3324	-0.1002

Supplementary Table 9. LME from Supplementary Table 7 split by Reward

Model: Std Score ~ Day*TW+(1|Subject)

(separately for data from low/high reward conditions)

Main factor variables: Score = linear, Day = linear, TW = linear

High Reward							
Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	33.53	4.4091	7.6047	80	0	24.7556	42.3045
Day	3.7954	1.5148	2.5056	80	0.0143	0.7809	6.8098
TW	0.2093	0.1458	1.4353	80	0.1551	-0.0809	0.4995
Day:TW	-0.1932	0.0501	-3.8569	80	0.0002	-0.2929	-0.0935
Low Reward							
Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	39.2248	3.35	11.7087	88	0	32.5673	45.8823
Day	-1.4585	0.9919	-1.4703	88	0.145	-3.4297	0.5128
TW	-0.0115	0.1103	-0.1045	88	0.917	-0.2308	0.2078
Day:TW	0.0231	0.0327	0.706	88	0.482	-0.0419	0.088

Supplementary Table 10. Best-fit LME to predict variance in FCNef scores for Dataset 2

Model: Std Score ~ Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: Score = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	38.0115	0.7551	50.3426	177	0	36.5214	39.5016
Day	-0.306	0.2326	-1.3152	177	0.1901	-0.7651	0.1531

Symptom questionnaire scores: detailed analysis

Supplementary Table 10 shows the average and standard deviation of symptom questionnaire scores, for each dataset separately, on all days that these were measured.

In Dataset 1, in line with a reduction in symptoms, participants' BDI ($t(43) = 4.36$, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$), Brooding, ($t(43) = 3.13$, $p_{FDR} = 0.002$), and trait anxiety ($t(43) = 2.75$, $p_{FDR} = 0.013$) scores from FCNef Day 4 were all significantly lower than those from Day 0. Likewise, in

Dataset 2, Participants' BDI, Brooding, and trait anxiety scores from FCNef Day 4 were lower than those from Day 0. In Dataset 2, these results reached significance for BDI ($t(46) = -3.85$, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$) and Brooding ($t(46) = -4.45$, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$) scores, but only trended towards significance for trait anxiety scores ($t(46) = -1.98$, $p_{FDR} = 0.063$).

We next tested to see if symptoms remained significantly more negative than baseline (Day 0) 1- and 2- months after FCNef. For dataset 1, BDI scores were found to be significantly more negative 1-month later ($t(30) = 3.51$, $p_{FDR} = 0.001$), but not significantly so 2-months later ($t(25) = 1.06$, $p_{FDR} = 0.151$). Brooding scores were found to be significantly more negative 1-month later ($t(28) = 2.96$, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$) and even more strongly so 2-months later ($t(25) = 4.31$, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$). Anxiety scores were found to be significantly more negative 1-month later ($t(28) = 2.47$, $p_{FDR} = 0.013$), but not 2-months later ($t(25) = 0.11$, $p_{FDR} = 0.457$). For Dataset 2, BDI scores were found to be significantly more negative 1-month later ($t(41) = 3.74$, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$), but not significantly so 2-months later ($t(36) = 1.61$, $p_{FDR} = 0.116$). Brooding scores were found to be significantly more negative 1-month later ($t(39) = 3.84$, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$) and even more strongly so 2-months later ($t(36) = 5.22$, $p_{FDR} < 0.001$). Anxiety scores trended towards being significantly more negative 1-month ($t(39) = 1.56$, $p_{FDR} = 0.063$) and 2-months later ($t(36) = 1.63$, $p_{FDR} = 0.063$).

LME comparisons are shown in Supplementary Table 11 for post-FCNef BDI change, Supplementary Table 14 for post-FCNef Brooding Change, and Supplementary Table 17 for post-FCNef Anxiety Change. Details of the best-fit post-FCNef BDI change LMEs are shown in Supplementary Table 12 (for dataset 1) and Supplementary Table 13 (for dataset 2). Details of the best-fit post-FCNef Brooding change LMEs are shown in Supplementary Table 15 (for dataset 1) and Supplementary Table 16 (for dataset 2). Details of the best-fit post-FCNef Anxiety change LMEs are shown in Supplementary Table 18 (for dataset 1) and Supplementary Table 19 (for dataset 2). Of these, the only significant effect found was a main effect of TW in the best-fit LME to predict post-FCNef symptom change for Brooding in dataset 1 (Supplementary Table 15). Follow-up t-test revealed that brooding symptoms reduced more in the 20s (1.97 ± 2.85) than the 40s (-0.78 ± 1.88) time-window condition ($t(97) = -2.24$, $p = 0.027$).

Supplementary Table 11: Average \pm standard deviation of questionnaire scores on different days of measurement for the two datasets

Dataset	Dataset 1				Dataset 2			
	Day 0	FCNef Day 4	Post 1-month	Post 2-months	Day 0	FCNef Day 4	Post 1-month	Post 2-months
BDI	11.36 ± 7.16	9.50 ± 6.03	8.97 ± 6.93	10.65 ± 7.21	11.15 ± 5.47	9.79 ± 5.67	8.88 ± 6.12	9.35 ± 6.06
Brooding	11.18 ± 3.93	10.05 ± 3.92	8.76 ± 2.98	8.88 ± 3.55	11.06 ± 3.33	9.45 ± 3.49	9.10 ± 3.06	8.88 ± 3.55
Anxiety	42.41 ± 9.82	40.34 ± 10.92	36.66 ± 7.61	40.62 ± 9.42	49.40 ± 8.70	48.28 ± 9.16	46.90 ± 9.46	47.05 ± 9.17

Supplementary Table 12: LMEs to predict BDI score change from baseline (Day 0) to post-FCNef days (FCNef Day 4 and the post 1- and 2- month follow-up experiments).

Note that, for Dataset 1, because the data from one of the sub-groups (C-40-H) was not collected in the post-1 and 2-month follow-up experiments, the level 4 LME could not be run.

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day'	580.61	-287.30	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day'	709.41	-351.71
2	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day+TW+Reward'	582.68	-286.34	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day+TW+ES'	711.87	-350.94
3	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day*TW+Reward'	584.66	-286.33	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day*TW+ES'	712.90	-350.45
	'BDI change~TW*Reward+post-FCNef Day '	584.64	-286.32	'BDI change~TW*ES+post-FCNef Day'	728.56	-349.77
	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day*Reward+TW'	583.38	-285.69	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day*ES+TW'	728.02	-349.50
4				'BDI change~post-FCNef Day*TW*ES'	713.70	-351.71
5	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day+(1 Subject)'	573.06	-282.53	'BDI change~post-FCNef Day+(1 Subject)'	702.21	-347.10

Supplementary: FCNef for Precision Medicine.

Supplementary Table 13. Best-fit LME to predict BDI Change from baseline to post-FCNef days for Dataset 1

Model: BDI change~ post-FCNef Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: BDI change = linear, post-FCNef Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-2.2604	0.9091	-2.4863	99	0.0146	-4.0643	-0.4564
Day	0.264	0.4339	0.6083	99	0.5444	-0.597	1.1249

Supplementary Table 14. Best-fit LME to predict BDI Change from baseline to post-FCNef days for Dataset 2

Model: BDI change~ post-FCNef Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: BDI change = linear, post-FCNef Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.4529	0.8235	-1.7644	124	0.0801	-3.0828	0.177
Day	-0.087	0.3716	-0.2341	124	0.8153	-0.8224	0.6485

Supplementary: FCNef for Precision Medicine.

Supplementary Table 15: LMEs to predict Brooding score change from baseline (Day 0) to post-FCNef days (FCNef Day 4 and the post 1- and 2- month follow-up experiments).

Note that, for dataset 1, because the data from one of the sub-groups (C-40-H) was not collected in the post-1 and 2-month follow-up experiments, the level 4 LME could not be run.

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day'	471.82	-232.91	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day'	590.39	-292.20
2	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day+ TW+Reward'	468.94	-229.47*	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day+ TW+ES'	593.60	-291.80
3	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day* TW+Reward'	470.70	-229.35	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day* TW+ES'	594.93	-291.46
	'Brooding change~post-TW* Reward+post-FCNef Day'	470.90	-229.45	'Brooding change~post-TW* ES+post-FCNef Day'	591.39	-289.7
	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day* Reward+TW'	470.89	-229.45	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day* ES+TW'	595.60	-291.80
4				'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day* TW*ES'	596.48	-289.24
5	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day+ TW+Reward+ (1 Subject)'	465.23	-226.61	'Brooding change~post-FCNef Day+ (1 Subject)'	570.82	-281.41

Supplementary Table 16. Best-fit LME to predict Brooding Change from baseline to post-FCNef days for Dataset 1

Model: Brooding change~ post-FCNef Day+TW+Reward+ (1|Subject)'

Main factor variables: Brooding change = linear, post-FCNef Day = linear, TW = linear, Reward = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.7098	0.7184	-2.38	95	0.0193	-3.1361	-0.2836
Day	-0.3312	0.2694	-1.2293	95	0.222	-0.866	0.2036
Reward	0.785	0.5999	1.3085	95	0.1939	-0.406	1.9759
TW	1.2955	0.6116	2.1181	95	0.0368	0.0813	2.5097

Supplementary Table 17. Best-fit LME to predict Brooding Change from baseline to post-FCNef days for Dataset 2

Model: Brooding change~ post-FCNef Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: Brooding change = linear, post-FCNef Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.292	0.5011	-2.5783	122	0.0111	-2.2839	-0.3
Day	-0.2469	0.2125	-1.1621	122	0.2475	-0.6675	0.1737

Supplementary Table 18: LMEs to predict Anxiety score change from baseline (Day 0) to post-FCNef days (FCNef Day 4 and the post 1- and 2- month follow-up experiments).

Note that, for Dataset 1, because the data from one of the sub-groups (C-40-H) was not collected in the post-1 and 2-month follow-up experiments, the level 4 LME could not be run.

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day'	658.32	-326.16	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day'	827.05	-410.52
2	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day+ TW+Reward'	661.38	-325.69	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day+ TW+ES'	830.68	-410.34
3	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day* TW+Reward'	663.03	-325.52	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day* TW+ES'	832.48	-410.24
	'Anxiety change~post-TW*Reward+ post-FCNef Day'	662.42	-325.21	'Anxiety change~post-TW*ES+post-FCNef Day'	832.57	-410.28
	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day* Reward+TW'	663.24	-325.62	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day* ES+TW'	832.60	410.30
4				'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day* TW*ES'	838.10	-410.05
5	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day+ (1 Subject)'	654.87	-323.44	'Anxiety change~post-FCNef Day+ (1 Subject)'	795.94	-393.97

Supplementary Table 19. Best-fit LME to predict Anxiety Change from from baseline to post-FCNef days for Dataset 1

Model: Anxiety change~ post-FCNef Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: Anxiety change = linear, post-FCNef Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.978	1.4668	-1.3486	97	0.1806	-4.8891	0.9331
Day	0.3821	0.7091	0.5388	97	0.5912	-1.0252	1.7894

Supplementary Table 20. Best-fit LME to predict Anxiety Change from baseline to post-FCNef days for Dataset 2

Model: Anxiety change~ post-FCNef Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: Anxiety change = linear, post-FCNef Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-0.7033	1.2445	-0.5651	122	0.573	-3.1669	1.7604
Day	-0.5289	0.5062	-1.0448	122	0.2982	-1.531	0.4732

rs-FC: detailed analysis

For dataset 1, the best-fit model to predict the dependent variable of DLPFC-PCC rs-FC over the course of the main experiment ('rs-FC~ TW*Reward+Day+(1|Subject)'; see Supplementary Table 21) showed significant main effects of Day and Reward (see Supplementary Table 22). Consistent with successful normalization of DLPFC-PCC rs-FC follow-up paired-sample t-tests to examine the main effect of Day showed that average DLPFC-PCC rs-FC was significantly more negative on all days of FCNef than it was on Day 0 (for Day 1 $t(42) = 2.64$, $p_{FDR} = 0.007$; for Day 2 $t(42) = 4.20$, $p_{FDR} = 0.003$; for Day 3 $t(42) = 2.60$, $p_{FDR} = 0.007$; for Day 4 $t(42) = 2.80$, $p_{FDR} = 0.007$). However, a follow-up paired-sample t-test to examine the main effect of Reward did not reach significance when comparing average LPFC-PCC rs-FC from the high (-0.065 ± 0.177) and low (-0.142 ± 0.165) reward conditions ($t(33) = -134$, $p = 0.191$). For dataset 2, the best-fit model to predict the dependent variable of DLPFC-PCC rs-FC over the course of the main experiment (rs-FC~ Day+(1|Subject)'); see Supplementary Table 21) showed no significant main effect of Day (see Supplementary Table 23), which indicates that the targeted rs-FC did not significantly change over experimental days. In line with this finding, DLPFC-PCC rs-FC was **not** significantly more negative on any day of FCNef than it was on Day 0 (for Day 1 $t(43) = 1.51$, $p_{FDR} = 0.143$; for Day 2 $t(42) = 1.50$, $p_{FDR} = 0.143$; for Day 3 $t(42) = 0.50$, $p_{FDR} = 0.308$; for Day 4 $t(42) = 0.55$, $p_{FDR} = 0.308$).

For dataset 1, the best-fit model to predict the dependent variable of post-FCNef changes in DLPFC-PCC rs-FC ('rs-FC~ Day+(1|Subject)'; see Supplementary Table 24) showed no main effect of post-FCNef Days (see Supplementary Table 25); This indicates that rs-FC change itself did not increase or decrease over the post-FCNef Days. However, when follow-up t-tests were conducted to compare rs-FC from before (Day 0) to after FCNef (post-FCNef days), it was found that rs-FC was significantly more negative on FCNef Day 4 ($t(42) = -2.80$, $p_{FDR} = 0.012$), significantly more negative 1-month later (-0.076 ± 0.216) ($t(29) = 2.23$, $p_{FDR} = 0.025$), and in a trend for the same direction (but not significantly so, perhaps due to the smaller sample size) even 2-months later (-0.089 ± 0.153) ($t(21) = 1.51$, $p_{FDR} = 0.072$). For dataset 2, the best-

fit model to predict the dependent variable of post-FCNef changes in DLPFC-PCC rs-FC ('rs-FC~ Day+(1|Subject)'; see Supplementary Table 24) showed no main effect of post-FCNef Days (see Supplementary Table 27), indicating that, for Dataset 2, rs-FC change itself did not increase or decrease over post-FCNef Days. Follow up t-tests showed rs-FC did not significantly differ from Day 0 to FCNef Day 4 ($t(46) = 0.55$, $p_{FDR} = 0.648$), 1-month later ($t(38) = -0.384$, $p_{FDR} = 0.648$), or 2-months later ($t(33) = -0.33$, $p_{FDR} = 0.648$).

Next we examined the best-fit models which **did** include regressors for the parameters of interest to predict the dependent variable of post-FCNef changes in DLPFC-PCC rs-FC for each dataset individually. For dataset 1, the best-fit of these models ('rs-FC~ Day*TW+Reward') showed a significant main effect of Reward (see Supplementary Table 26). Consistent with this, follow up paired-sample t-tests split by reward condition even more strongly showed significantly reduced rs-FC in the long-term for participants who received high reward ($t(19) = 2.42$, $p_{FDR} = 0.021$ on D4, $t(10) = 2.57$, $p_{FDR} = 0.021$ at 1-month, and $t(5) = 2.00$, $p_{FDR} = 0.051$ at 2-months), but this was found not at all for participants who received low reward ($t(22) = 1.57$, $p_{FDR} = 0.195$ on D4, $t(18) = 1.04$, $p_{FDR} = 0.234$ at 1-month, and $t(15) = 0.68$, $p_{FDR} = 0.254$ at 2-months). On the contrary, for dataset 2, the best-fit model to predict the dependent variable of post-FCNef changes in DLPFC-PCC rs-FC which **did** include regressors for the parameters of interest ('rs-FC~ Day+TW+Reward'; see Supplementary Table 28) showed no significant main effects.

Supplementary Table 21: Average \pm standard deviation resting-state functional connectivity between the LPFC and PCC

Note that the data for **all** participants who had their rs-FC measured on each day is represented here. Not all participants came back for the follow-up experiments so the sample sizes are different in different cells of this table, even within a dataset (see Supplementary Table X for details). This also means that the data represented here is not directly comparable to that Figure 4 of the main text, in which “rs-FC changes” (post-FCNef data - D0 data) were calculated using only the data from participants who had both relevant measurements taken.

	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Overall	High Reward	Low Reward	Overall	Consecutive	Non-Consecutive
D0	-0.004 \pm 0.227	0.039 \pm 0.242	-0.042 \pm 0.209	-0.081 \pm 0.248	-0.042 \pm 0.209	-0.118 \pm 0.279
D1	-0.098 \pm 0.228	-0.029 \pm 0.224	-0.165 \pm 0.216	-0.137 \pm 0.241	-0.165 \pm 0.216	-0.109 \pm 0.265
D2	-0.148 \pm 0.198	-0.087 \pm 0.190	-0.216 \pm 0.188	-0.129 \pm 0.243	-0.216 \pm 0.188	-0.058 \pm 0.263
D3	-0.108 \pm 0.244	-0.041 \pm 0.261	-0.165 \pm 0.219	-0.103 \pm 0.229	-0.165 \pm 0.219	-0.047 \pm 0.227
D4	-0.092 \pm 0.233	-0.072 \pm 0.231	-0.109 \pm 0.238	-0.099 \pm 0.224	-0.109 \pm 0.238	-0.090 \pm 0.215
P1	-0.076 \pm 0.216	-0.032 \pm 0.238	-0.102 \pm 0.205	-0.073 \pm 0.218	-0.102 \pm 0.205	-0.045 \pm 0.232
P2	-0.089 \pm 0.153	-0.067 \pm 0.130	-0.097 \pm 0.164	-0.080 \pm 0.224	-0.097 \pm 0.164	-0.064 \pm 0.270

Supplementary Table 22: Comparison of LMEs to predict rs-FC from the main experiment

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'rs-FC~ Day'	-19.76	12.88	'rs-FC~ Day'	-7.12	6.56
2	'rs-FC~ Day+ TW+Reward'	-25.65	17.83	'rs-FC~ Day+TW +ES'	-6.94	8.47
3	'rs-FC~ Day* TW+Reward'	-23.73	17.87	'rs-FC~ Day* TW+ES'	-4.95	8.48
	'rs-FC~ TW* Reward+Day'	-30.05	21.03*	'rs-FC~ TW* ES+Day'	-6.22	9.11
	'rs-FC~ Day* Reward+TW'	-23.88	17.94	'rs-FC~ Day*ES + TW'	-6.31	9.16
4	'rs-FC~ Day* TW*Reward'	-24.50	21.25	'rs-FC~ Day* TW*ES'	-1.37	9.82
5	'rs-FC~ TW* Reward+Day +(1 Subject)'	-73.36	43.68***	'rs-FC~ Day +(1 Subject)'	-92.85	40.42***

Supplementary Table 23. Best-fit LME to predict rs-FC from the main experiment for Dataset 1

Model: rs-FC~ TW*Reward+Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: rs-FC = linear, TW = linear, Reward = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-0.1771	0.1045	-1.6956	204	0.0915	-0.3831	0.0288
Day	-0.018	0.0081	-2.2115	204	0.0281	-0.034	-0.002
Reward	0.3141	0.1466	2.1433	204	0.0333	0.0252	0.6031
TW	0.0034	0.0034	1.0207	204	0.3086	-0.0032	0.0101
Reward:TW	-0.0075	0.0049	-1.5496	204	0.1228	-0.0171	0.002

Supplementary Table 24. Best-fit LME to predict rs-FC from the main experiment for Dataset 2

Model: rs-FC~ Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: rs-FC = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-0.1065	0.0352	-3.0262	222	0.0028	-0.1759	-0.0372
Day	-0.0008	0.0073	-0.1028	222	0.9182	-0.0152	0.0137

Supplementary Table 25: Comparison of LMEs to predict long-term changes in rs-FC

Note that, for Dataset 1, because the data from one of the sub-groups (C-40-H) was not collected in the post-1 and 2-month follow-up experiments, the level 4 LME could not be run.

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'rs-FC~ Day'	-29.48	17.74	'rs-FC~ Day'	-7.39	6.69
2	'rs-FC~ Day+TW+Reward'	-28.41	19.21	'rs-FC~ Day+TW+ES'	-4.32	7.16
3	'rs-FC~ Day*TW+Reward'	-27.19	19.59	'rs-FC~ Day*TW+ES'	-3.03	7.51
	'rs-FC~ TW*Reward+Day'	-29.18	20.59	'rs-FC~ TW*ES+Day'	-2.69	7.34
4	'rs-FC~ Day*Reward+TW'	-27.30	19.65	'rs-FC~ Day*ES+TW'	-3.68	7.84
				'rs-FC~ Day*TW*ES'	1.09	3.52
5	'rs-FC~ Day+(1 Subject)'	-40.46	24.23	'rs-FC~ Day+(1 Subject)'	-29.28	23.89

Supplementary Table 26. Best-fit LME to predict long-term changes in rs-FC for Dataset 1

Model: rs-FC~ Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: rs-FC = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-0.0839	0.0434	-1.9309	93	0.0565	-0.1701	0.0024
Day	0.0015	0.0206	0.0736	93	0.9415	-0.0393	0.0423

Supplementary Table 27. Best-fit of the LMEs that included regressors for parameters of interest to predict long-term changes in rs-FC for Dataset 1

Model: rs-FC~ Day*TW+Reward

Main factor variables: rs-FC = linear, Day = linear, TW = linear, Reward = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	t	DF	p Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	0.0354	0.0918	0.386	90	0.7004	-0.1469	0.2178
Day	0.0083	0.0263	0.3154	90	0.7532	-0.044	0.0606
Reward	-0.2799	0.1295	-2.1618	90	0.0333	-0.5371	-0.0227
TW	-0.0036	0.0026	-1.3926	90	0.1672	-0.0087	0.0015
Reward:TW	0.008	0.0048	1.6753	90	0.0973	-0.0015	0.0176

Supplementary Table 28. Best-fit LME to predict long-term changes in rs-FC for Dataset 2

Model: rs-FC~ Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: rs-FC = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	t	DF	p Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-0.0819	0.0446	-1.8346	118	0.0691	-0.1703	0.0065
Day	0.0031	0.0188	0.1678	118	0.867	-0.034	0.0403

Supplementary Table 29. Best-fit of the LMEs that included regressors for parameters of interest to predict long-term changes in rs-FC for Dataset 2

Model: rs-FC~ Day+ES+TW

Main factor variables: rs-FC = linear, Day = linear, ES = linear, TW = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	tStat	DF	pValue	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-0.0605	0.0606	-0.9983	116	0.3202	-0.1804	0.0595
Day	0.0005	0.0256	0.0203	116	0.9838	-0.0501	0.0512
ES	0.0039	0.0417	0.0946	116	0.9248	-0.0786	0.0865
TW	-0.0402	0.0417	-0.9634	116	0.3373	-0.1228	0.0424

Relationship between rs-FC Changes and symptom questionnaire changes: detailed analysis

LME comparisons are shown in Supplementary Table 29 to predict the relationship between rs-FC and BDI changes, Supplementary Table 34 to predict the relationship between rs-FC and Brooding changes, and Supplementary Table 38 to predict the relationship between rs-FC and Anxiety changes. Details of the best-fit LMEs to predict the relationship between rs-FC and BDI changes are shown in Supplementary Table 30 (for dataset 1) and Supplementary Table 31 (for dataset 2). Details of the best-fit LMEs to predict the relationship between rs-FC and Brooding changes are shown in Supplementary Table 35 (for dataset 1) and Supplementary Table 37 (for dataset 2). Details of the best-fit LMEs to predict the relationship between rs-FC and Anxiety changes are shown in Supplementary Table 39 (for dataset 1) and Supplementary Table 40 (for dataset 2). All follow-up analyses are described in the main text.

Results for relationship between rs-FC Changes and symptom questionnaire changes when outliers were included

There were two outliers: one whose BDI Change was more than 3 std lower than the group mean and the other whose Brooding Change was more than 3 std lower than the group mean. In all relevant supplementary tables, results are shown with the data of these outliers excluded. Likewise, results for all relevant analyses in the main text were reported with the data of these outliers excluded and these outliers were not included in the figures. However, the results do not change even when the data of the outliers was included. Specifically, even when the data of the BDI Change outlier was included, the same best-fit model ('BDI Change~rs-FC Change') was found to predict the dependent variable of BDI Change and this still showed a significant main effect of rs-FC Change (estimate = 5.96, SE = 1.90, $t=3.13$, $df = 42$, $p = 0.003$). Corresponding to this, a significant positive correlation between BDI Change and rs-FC Change was still found ($n = 44$, $r = 0.427$, $p = 0.004$). Likewise, even when the data of the Brooding Change outlier was included, the same best-fit model (Brooding Change~rs-FC Change') was found to predict the dependent variable of Brooding Change and this still showed a significant main effect of rs-FC Change (estimate=3.60, SE=1.70, $t = 2.11$, $df = 40$, $p = 0.040$). Corresponding to this, a significant positive correlation between Brooding Change and rs-FC Change was still found ($n = 44$, $r = 0.304$, $p = 0.045$). When the data of the outlier was included in the test to see if the correlation coefficients for the Brooding/rs-FC and the Anxiety/rs-FC correlations significantly differed, a trend for a significant difference was still found ($n = 44$, $z = 1.4946$, $p = 0.068$). As reported in the main text, a more complex model which included regressors for the parameters of interest almost superseded the best-fit model. This was even more strongly the case when the data from the outlier was included ('Brooding Change~rs-FC Change*Reward+TW'; $\chi^2(3) = 7.40$, $p = 0.060$). Even with the data for this outlier included, this more complex model trended towards showing a significant interaction between Reward Change and rs-FC Change (estimate=5.76, SE=3.19, $t = 1.80$, $df = 39$, $p = 0.079$). This outlier was in the low reward condition and even when their data was included there was found to be no significant correlation between Brooding Change and rs-FC Change ($n = 23$, $r = 0.057$, $p = 0.798$) for this condition. When the data of this outlier was included in the test to see if the correlation coefficients for the Brooding/rs-FC and the Anxiety/rs-FC correlations significantly

Supplementary: FCNef for Precision Medicine.

differed, there remained no significant difference for the low reward condition ($n = 23$, $z = 0.4866$, $p = 0.313$).

Supplementary Table 30: Comparison of LMEs to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and BDI changes

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change'	193.89	-93.95	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change'	221.36	-107.68
2	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change+ TW+Reward'	197.56	-93.78	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change+TW+ES'	223.92	-106.96
3	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change*TW+Reward'	196.56	-92.28	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change*TW+ES'	225.48	-106.74
	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change* Reward+TW'	196.53	-92.27	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change*ES+TW'	219.99	-103.99#
	'BDI Change~Reward*TW+rs-FC Change'	197.50	-92.75	'BDI Change~ES*TW+rs-FC Change'	224.90	-106.45
4	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change* TW*Reward'	197.94	-89	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change* TW*ES'	222.10	-102.05#
5	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change+ (1 Subject)'	195.89	-93.95	'BDI Change~rs-FC Change+ (1 Subject)'	223.36	-107.68

Supplementary Table 31. Best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and BDI changes for Dataset 1

Model: BDI Change~rs-FC Change

Main factor variables: BDI Change = linear, rs-FC Change = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.2104	0.3498	-3.4604	41	0.0013	-1.9169	-0.504
rs-FC change	5.8553	1.6146	3.6264	41	0.0008	2.5945	9.1162

Supplementary Table 32. Best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and BDI changes for Dataset 2

Model: BDI Change~rs-FC Change

Main factor variables: BDI Change = linear, rs-FC Change = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.3781	0.35	-3.9372	45	0.0003	-2.0831	-0.6731
rs-FC change	-0.9013	1.5417	-0.5846	45	0.5618	-4.0065	2.204

Supplementary Table 33. The first almost best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and BDI changes for Dataset 2

Model: BDI Change~rs-FC Change*ES+TW

Main factor variables: BDI Change = linear, rs-FC Change = linear, ES = linear, TW = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.1701	0.5585	-2.095	42	0.0422	-2.2972	-0.043
TW	0.4105	0.6492	0.6323	42	0.5306	-0.8997	1.7208
ES	-0.4946	0.6677	-0.7407	42	0.463	-1.8421	0.853
rs-FC change	-4.2154	1.8727	-2.251	42	0.0297	-7.9947	-0.4362
ES:rs-FC change	7.5124	2.987	2.515	42	0.0158	1.4844	13.5405

Supplementary: FCNef for Precision Medicine.

Supplementary Table 34. The second almost best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and BDI changes for Dataset 2

Model: BDI Change~rs-FC Change*TW*ES

Main factor variables: BDI Change = linear, rs-FC Change = linear, TW = linear, ES = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.4834	0.6175	-2.4023	39	0.0212	-2.7323	-0.2344
TW	1.0553	0.8723	1.2098	39	0.2336	-0.709	2.8196
ES	0.6253	0.9785	0.639	39	0.5265	-1.3539	2.6044
rs-FC change	-6.5239	2.779	-2.3476	39	0.0241	-12.1449	-0.9029
TW:ES	-1.876	1.3045	-1.4382	39	0.1584	-4.5145	0.7625
TW:rs-FC change	3.9664	3.6428	1.0888	39	0.2829	-3.4018	11.3346
ES:rs-FC change	13.8451	4.9092	2.8203	39	0.0075	3.9154	23.7748
TW:ES:rs-FC change	-9.4917	6.0712	-1.5634	39	0.126	-21.7719	2.7885

Supplementary Table 35: Comparison of LMEs to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and Brooding changes

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change'	202.9 1	-98.45	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change'	223.9 6	229.51
2	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change+ TW+Reward'	180.0 9	-85.05***	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change+TW+ES'	227.8 0	108.90
3	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change*TW+Reward'	181.8 8	-84.94	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change*TW+ES'	229.7 7	- 108.89
	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change* Reward+TW'	177.9 9	-83.00#	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change*ES+TW'	229.8 0	- 108.90
	'Brooding Change~Reward*TW+rs -FC Change'	182.0 3	-85.01	'Brooding Change~ES*TW+rs -FC Change'	227.4 9	- 107.75
4	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change* TW*Reward'	182.0 7	197.92	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change* TW*ES'	232.3 1	- 107.16
5	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change* Reward+TW+ (1 Subject)'	179.9 9	-83.00	'Brooding Change~rs-FC Change+ (1 Subject)'	225.9 6	- 108.98

Supplementary Table 36. Best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and Brooding changes for Dataset 1

Model: Brooding Change~rs-FC Change

Main factor variables: Brooding Change = linear, rs-FC Change = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-0.6129	0.2941	-2.0837	41	0.0435	-1.2069	-0.0189
rs-FC change	4.0785	1.3547	3.0106	41	0.0044	1.3426	6.8143

Supplementary Table 37. Almost best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and Brooding changes for Dataset 1

Model: Brooding Change~rs-FC Change*Reward+TW'

Main factor variables: Brooding Change = linear, rs-FC Change = linear, Reward = linear, TW = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.454	0.8426	-1.7256	38	0.0925	-3.1598	0.2518
TW	0.0099	0.0262	0.3777	38	0.7078	-0.0431	0.0628
Reward	1.1836	0.5461	2.1673	38	0.0365	0.0781	2.2891
rs-FC change	1.5102	1.7603	0.8579	38	0.3963	-2.0534	5.0739
Reward:rs-FC change	5.2949	2.5532	2.0738	38	0.0449	0.1263	10.4636

Supplementary Table 38. Best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and Brooding changes for Dataset 2

Model: Brooding Change~rs-FC Change

Main factor variables: Brooding Change = linear, rs-FC Change = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.6059	0.3599	-4.4622	45	0.0001	-2.3307	-0.881
rs-FC change	0.6074	1.5853	0.3831	45	0.7034	-2.5855	3.8003

Supplementary Table 39: Comparison of LMEs to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and Anxiety changes

Level	Dataset 1			Dataset 2		
	Formula	AIC	LogLik	Formula	AIC	LogLik
1	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change'	256.79	-125.39	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change'	266.52	-120.26
2	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change+TW+Reward'	260.17	-125.08	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change+TW+ES'	269.48	-129.74
3	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change*TW+Reward'	261.88	-124.94	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change*TW+ES'	279.33	-128.12
	'Anxiety Change ~ rs-FC Change* Reward+TW'	262.07	-125.03	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change*ES+TW'	271.02	-129.51
	'Anxiety Change~Reward*TW+rs-FC Change'	259.78	-123.89	'Anxiety Change~ES*TW+rs-FC Change'	271.42	-129.71
4	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change*TW*Reward'	264.68	-123.34	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change*TW*ES'	273.51	-127.75
5	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change+(1 Subject)'	258.79	-125.39	'Anxiety Change~rs-FC Change+(1 Subject)'	268.92	-130.26

Supplementary: FCNef for Precision Medicine.

Supplementary Table 40. Best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and Anxiety changes for Dataset 1

Model: rs-FC~ Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: rs-FC = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.0714	0.6739	-1.59	42	0.1193	-2.4313	0.2885
rs-FC change	-0.3428	3.1394	-0.1092	42	0.9136	-6.6784	5.9928

Supplementary Table 41. Best-fit LME to predict the relationship between rs-FC Changes and Anxiety changes for Dataset 2

Model: rs-FC~ Day+(1|Subject)

Main factor variables: rs-FC = linear, Day = linear

Name	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	DF	<i>p</i> Value	Lower	Upper
(Intercept)	-1.1214	0.566	-1.9814	45	0.0537	-2.2613	0.0185
rs-FC change	0.3393	2.4931	0.1361	45	0.8923	-4.682	5.3607

References

1. Beck, A.T., Steer, R.A., & Brown, G.K. *Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II): Manual and Questionnaire*. (1996).
2. Treynor, W., Gonzalez, R. & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. Rumination Reconsidered: A Psychometric Analysis. *Cognit. Ther. Res.* **27**, 247–259 (2003).
3. Hasegawa, A. Translation and initial validation of the Japanese version of the Ruminative Responses Scale. *Psychol. Rep.* **112**, 716–726 (2013).
4. Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., Lushene, R. & Vagg, P. R. Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory; Palo Alto, CA, Ed. *Palo Alto: Spielberger* (1983).
5. Taylor, J. E. *et al.* Depressive symptoms reduce when dorsolateral prefrontal cortex-precuneus connectivity normalizes after functional connectivity neurofeedback. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 2581 (2022).
6. Feinberg, D. A. *et al.* Multiplexed echo planar imaging for sub-second whole brain fMRI and fast diffusion imaging. *PLoS One* **5**, e15710 (2010).
7. Moeller, S. *et al.* Multiband multislice GE-EPI at 7 tesla, with 16-fold acceleration using partial parallel imaging with application to high spatial and temporal whole-brain fMRI. *Magn. Reson. Med.* **63**, 1144–1153 (2010).
8. Xu, J. *et al.* Evaluation of slice accelerations using multiband echo planar imaging at 3 T. *Neuroimage* **83**, 991–1001 (2013).