Supplementary Methods

Data acquisition

T1-weighted images were acquired with repetition time (TR) of 7.312ms, echo time (TE) of 3.016ms and a flip angle of 11°. Images were acquired in the sagittal plane with field of view (FOV) of 270 x 270mm, matrix size of 256 x 256 voxels and slice thickness and gap of 1.2mm. T2-weighted fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) and fast recovery fast spin echo (FRFSE) sequences were acquired for infarct and lesion delineation. The FLAIR sequence was acquired with TR of 8000ms, TE of 120-130ms and flip angle of 90-111°. The FRFSE sequence used TR of 4380ms, TE of 54-65ms and flip angle of 90-111°. Images were acquired in the axial plane with FOV of 240 x 240mm for both sequences. The matrix size for the FLAIR sequence was 256 x 128 voxels and 320 x 256 voxels for the FRFSE sequence. Slice positions were aligned for both sequences with 36 slices at 4mm thickness for FLAIR and 72 slices at 2mm thickness for FRFSE.

Image geometry for the diffusion-weighted images covered the whole brain using 2mm axial slices with matrix size of 128 x 128 voxels and FOV of 256 x 256mm, resulting in 2mm isotropic resolution. Participants' heads were aligned such that the intercommisural line was as close to the axial plane as possible. Acquisition was peripherally gated to the cardiac cycle, giving a sequence duration of 11-20min, a TR of 10,000-14,118ms and a TE of 66-78ms with a flip angle of 90°.

Lesion definition

Lesions were drawn manually on FLAIR images. When necessary, diffusion images acquired acutely were used to identify the acute infarct. Lesion volume was calculated from FLAIR images and images containing lesion maps were co-registered into Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) standard space, so that anatomically homologous brain areas were aligned.

Connectome reconstruction

The *recon-all* command implemented in FreeSurfer (v6.0)

(http://surfer.nmr.mgh.harvard.edu/) was used for the segmentation of T1-weighted images as described previously.¹ Cortical and subcortical parcellations were validated by manual inspection. A five-tissue-type segmented image was generated from the pre-processed T1-weighted images. Response functions were estimated using the single-fibre *tournier* algorithm² and constrained spherical deconvolution was applied to obtain fibre orientation distributions (FOD). Anatomically constrained tractography with the 2nd order integration over Fibre Orientation Distribution (iFOD2) algorithm,³ was used to generate individual tractograms for each participant.⁴ Tractograms were generated until 100 million streamlines were obtained with a length of 5-250mm, step size of 1mm and FOD amplitude threshold of 0.1. The spherical-deconvolution informed filtering of tractograms (SIFT) algorithm was applied to reduce the overall streamline count to 10 million streamlines, which is more biologically meaningful.⁵ Individual connectivity matrices were manually inspected for missing connections (edges) to nodes located in lesions.

Free-water imaging was used on the pre-processed DWI data to quantify the amount of extracellular free-water (FW) by separating the diffusion properties of brain tissue, such as white matter tracts, from the surrounding extracellular free water, such as cerebrospinal fluid.⁶ Partial volume effects were removed before estimating measures of white matter microstructure.⁶

Graph theoretical measures

Whole-brain structural graph theoretical analyses were conducted on the interregional connectivity matrices using the Brain Connectivity Toolbox (<u>http://www.brain-connectivity-toolbox.net</u>). In order to facilitate global network comparisons, we applied a sparsity threshold, which ensures that the number of edges are matched across participants by retaining 90% of the top connections for each participant. The sparsity threshold facilitates the exclusion of connections with connectivity strengths of 0 across all subjects from hypothesis testing and before calculation of global network measures.

Grey and white matter measurements from the reward system

Regions of the reward system were selected based on a literature review of fMRI and structural MRI studies of the reward system in depression, which included two fMRI metaanalyses and one systematic review⁷⁻⁹ (see Supplementary Table S1). The regions identified by the literature review included seven subcortical structures, i.e. amygdala (Amy), nucleus accumbens (NAc), thalamus (Th), hippocampus (HPC), caudate (Cau), putamen (Pu) and ventral tegmental area (VTA) and five cortical structures, i.e. dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dIPFC), medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC), orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) and insula (Ins). Grey matter volumes were calculated for all identified regions constituting the reward system, except the VTA. The VTA is a very small area, which has not yet been well characterized structurally or functionally in human MRI studies⁷ and was therefore excluded. The remaining grey matter regions were defined by the parcellations derived from the segmentation of the T1-weighted images based on the Desikan-Killiany atlas also used for the connectome analysis. Supplementary Table 1: Literature review of functional and structural MRI studies of the reward system in depression

Table S1. Literature review MRI studies of the reward system in depression				
brain region	reference	findings		
ventral tegmental area (VTA)	Russo & Nestler $(2013)^7$ Geugies et al. $(2019)^{10}$	lower activity in patients with anhedonia ¹⁰		
amygdala (Amy)	Russo & Nestler (2013) ⁷ Bora et al. (2012) ¹¹	Reduced volume ^{7, 11} decreased BOLD activity during reward task ⁷		
thalamus (Th)	Zhang et al (2013) ⁸ Mitterschiffthaler et al. (2003) ¹² Segarra et al. (2016) ¹³ Ancelin et al. (2019) ¹⁴	reduced volume ¹⁴ decreased BOLD activity during reward task ^{8, 12, 13}		
hippocampus (HPC)	Russo & Nestler $(2013)^7$ Campbell et al. $(2004)^{15}$ Geerlings & Gerritsen $(2017)^{16}$ Ballmaier et al. $(2008)^{17}$	Reduced volume ^{7, 15-17} decreased BOLD activity during reward task ⁷		
nucleus accumbens (NAc)	Russo & Nestler (2013) ⁷ Pizzagalli et al. (2009) ¹⁸ Epstein et al. (2006) ¹⁹ Segarra et al. (2016) ¹³ Ancelin et al. (2019) ¹⁴	reduced volume ^{7, 14} decreased BOLD activity at rest ⁷ and during reward task ^{7, 13, 18, 19}		
caudate (Cau)	Zhang et al (2013) ⁸ Enneking et al. (2018) ²⁰ Keren et al. (2019) ⁹ Pizzagalli et al. (2009) ¹⁸ Epstein et al. (2006) ¹⁹ Forbes et al. (2009) ²¹ Segarra et al. (2016) ¹³	reduced volume in MDD with anhedonia ^{9, 18} and increased symptom severity ⁹ decreased BOLD activation during reward task ^{8, 9, 13, 18, 19, 21}		
putamen (Pu)	Zhang et al (2013) ⁸	reduced volume ²³		

in such (Luc)	Keren et al. $(2019)^9$ Mitterschiffthaler et al. $(2003)^{12}$ Robinson et al. $(2012)^{22}$ Pizzagalli et al. $(2009)^{18}$ Epstein et al. $(2006)^{19}$ Klok et al. $(2019)^{23}$	decreased BOLD activity during reward tasks ^{8, 9, 12, 18, 19, 22}
insula (Ins)	Zhang et al (2013) ^o Mitterschiffthaler et al. (2003) ¹² Dichter et al. (2012) ²⁴ Ancelin et al. (2019) ¹⁴	decreased BOLD activity during reward task ^{8, 12, 24}
dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC)	Russo & Nestler (2013) ⁷ Forbes et al. (2009) ²¹ Bora et al. (2012) ¹¹	reduced volume ¹¹ decreased BOLD activity during reward task ⁷ increased BOLD activity during reward anticipation ²¹
middle frontal gyrus (MFG)	Zhang et al (2013) ⁸ Dichter et al. (2012) ²⁴	increased BOLD activity during reward anticipation ^{8, 24}
superior frontal gyrus (SFG)	Zhang et al (2013) ⁸	increased BOLD activity during reward task ⁸
medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC)	Russo & Nestler (2013) ⁷ Mitterschiffthaler et al. (2003) ¹² Epstein et al. (2006) ¹⁹ Forbes et al. (2009) ²¹ Segarra et al. (2016) ¹³	reduced volume ⁷ smaller BOLD activity during reward tasks ^{7, 12, 13, 19} increased BOLD activity during reward anticipation ²¹
orbitofrontal cortex (OFC)	Russo & Nestler (2013) ⁷ Mitterschiffthaler et al. (2003) ¹² Dichter et al. (2012) ²⁴ Segarra et al. (2016) ¹³	reduced volume ⁷ decreased BOLD activity during reward tasks ¹² ^{13, 24}
Medial orbitofron- tal cortex (mOFC)	Rothkirch et al. (2017) ²⁵	decreased BOLD activity during reward task ²⁵

anterior cingulate cortex (ACC)	Russo & Nestler (2013) ⁷	reduced volume ¹¹
	Zhang et al (2013) ⁸	increased BOLD signal during
	Mitterschiffthaler et al. $(2003)^{12}$	reward task ⁷ and reward anticipation ²⁴ reduced BOLD signal during reward tasks ^{8, 12}
	Dichter et al. $(2012)^{24}$	
	Bora et al. (2012) ¹¹	

Note. MFG and SFG are part of dlPFC and mOFC is part of OFC.

The deterministic tractography algorithm based on spherical deconvolution, which was used for the reconstruction of the cingulum bundle and medial forebrain bundle (MFB) takes the FOD image as input and samples it at each streamline step. The Newton optimization is performed on the sphere from the current streamline tangent orientation to locate the orientation of the nearest FOD amplitude peak. The step size of the tracking algorithm was set to 0.5mm, with a cut-off value for the FOD amplitude of 0.05 and maximum turning angle of 45°. The minimum pathlength for the cingulum subdivisions was 10mm and for the MFB 30mm. Reproducibility of the cingulum subdivisions and MFB were assessed with the inter-rater reliability between two raters on a subset of 10 randomly chosen participants. The ICC ranged from 0.89-0.97 for FA and 0.85-0.98 for FW, indicating that the interrater reproducibility was very good for all tract segments.

Tractography procedure

Anatomical landmarks were identified on color-coded diffusion tensor maps. An exclusion region of interest (ROI) was drawn across the midline sagittal plane to exclude interhemispheric projections. Further exclusion ROIs were drawn to exclude tracts that deviated from the anatomy of the cingulum bundle or medial forebrain bundle. All cingulum subdivisions and the medial forebrain bundle were reconstructed in the left and right hemisphere.

The anterior, middle, posterior and parahippocampal subdivisions were reconstructed as described by Metzler-Baddeley et al (2012), with minor modifications ²⁶: The anterior cingulum was defined as the cingulum segment rostral to the anterior commissure. The seed ROI was drawn in line with the anterior commissure in the coronal plane. One inclusion ROI was placed in the slice where the most inferior part of the genu can be identified in the axial plane and another inclusion ROI was drawn in the coronal plane where the most posterior part of the genu is visible. The middle cingulum was defined as the cingulum segment located between the anterior and posterior commissure. The seed ROI was drawn in line with the anterior commissure and one inclusion ROI was drawn in line with the posterior commissure in the coronal plane. The posterior cingulum was defined as the cingulum segment caudal to the posterior commissure. The seed ROI was placed in line with the posterior commissure in the coronal plane. One inclusion ROI was drawn in the slice where the most inferior part of the splenium can be identified in the axial plane and another inclusion ROI was placed in the coronal plane where the most anterior part of the splenium is visible. The parahippocampal cingulum was reconstructed by placing a seed ROI in the coronal plane where the most posterior part of the splenium is visible. One inclusion ROI was drawn below the splenium in the most anterior slice where the anterior splenium can be seen. The medial forebrain bundle was reconstructed based on adapted protocols by Coenen et al. (2012)²⁷ and Anthofer et al. (2015)²⁸: A seed ROI was placed in the medial part of the ventral tegmental area in the axial plane. One inclusion ROI was drawn in the axial plane at the junction of the caudate nucleus and nucleus accumbens.

Statistical analysis

Voxel-based symptom lesion mapping (VSLM) was performed on the co-registered lesion images using the toolbox NiiStat (NiiStat, RRID:SCR_014152) implemented in

MATLAB 2018b.²⁹ A univariate linear regression analysis was conducted with lesion location as independent variable and GDS scores (depression severity) as outcome variable, using 5000 permutations. The purpose of the VLSM analysis was to confirm that there was no strong relationship with single lesion locations, consistent with the existing literature. Therefore, statistical maps of association are presented unthresholded and report the maximum effect sizes in this sample for associations between PSD and lesion location.

In order to test for whole-brain topological differences between groups, a multivariate analysis of covariances (MANCOVA) was performed with the independent variable *group* (HC/D-/D+) and the six dependent variables *global efficiency* (*FA/FW*), *modularity* (*FA/FW*), and *centrality coefficient* (*FA/FW*), using SPSS 25.0.³⁰ Post-hoc comparisons were adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni correction at an alpha level of 0.05. Network-based statistics (NBS, <u>https://sites.google.com/site/bctnet/comparison/nbs</u>) were used to investigate whole-brain between-group (HC/D-/D+) differences in FA and FW.³¹ Supra-threshold connections were considered if their test-statistic exceeded a *p*-value of < .001 with 10000 permutations (*t*-statistic > 3). More conservative test-statistic supra-thresholds of 3.5 (*p* < .0005) and 4 (*p* < .0001) were also tested (see Supplements). Subnetworks (connected components) were then identified with a family-wise error (FWE)-corrected *p*-value of .05.

All remaining statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 25.0.³⁰ To test for structural group differences in the reward system, three repeated-measures analysis of covariances (ANCOVAs) were performed with *group* (HC/D-/D+) as between- subjects factor and *hemisphere* (left/right) as within-subjects factor. Each of the ANCOVAs included an additional within-subjects factor, i.e. *FA* (anterior cingulum/middle cingulum/ posterior cingulum/parahippocampal cingulum/MFB), *FW* (anterior cingulum/middle cingulum/ posterior cingulum/ parahippocampal cingulum/MFB) or *grey matter volume* (HPC/Th/NAc/Amy/Cau/Pu/Ins/ dlPFC/mPFC/OFC/ACC), respectively. Post-hoc comparisons were adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni correction at an alpha level of 0.05. A final ANCOVA was performed to test for possible associations between vascular risk factors of stroke (*ECG/ hypertension/ diabetes mellitus/ smoking/ ischemic heart disease/statins*, see Table 1) and measures from the reward system.

In order to investigate whether global graph theoretical metrics or structural changes in the reward system account for PSD severity, two multiple linear regression analysis were performed to in the stroke sample only. All independent variables and covariates were demeaned. Sex, age and handedness are known to vary with brain structure and the role of lesion characteristics on depression severity is still unclear. In order to test if these covariates were significantly associated with depression severity, they were added to the regression models in a first step. Insignificant covariates were dropped from the models, leaving only handedness and days since lesion as covariates in both regression analyses. In the first multiple linear regression analysis, all global network measures were added as predictors in addition to the significant covariates and GDS scores were entered as outcome variable. Due to the large number of FA, FW and grey matter volume measures from the reward system, the second regression was run as a stepwise multiple linear regression analysis, to limit the number of predictors in the model and thereby reduce the chance of inflation of results. GDS scores were again entered as outcome variable. Variance inflation factors (VIF) were calculated for both regression analyses to check for multicollinearity.

Due to between-group differences in sex (see Table 1), sex was added as a covariate to all analyses. Outliers were defined as 1.5 times the interquartile (IQ) range and were assessed for all variables and analyses.

Supplementary Results

No statistical outliers were detected in the dataset. A repeated-measures ANOVA did not detect significant main effects for *vascular risk factors* or interactions with *region* or *hemisphere* (all p > 0.26), indicating no obvious association between vascular risk factors and changes in the reward system.

Associations between depression and lesion characteristics

There was no simple relationship between lesion location and the presence of depression, apparent on visual inspection of the lesion overlay maps of the D+ and D- groups (see Figure S1).



Figure S1. Lesion locations mapped for all participants in standard (MNI) space does not reveal a pattern of association between GDS scores and lesion location. A) Lesions mapped for participants without depression, i.e. GDS scores from 0 (green) to 9 (blue). B) Lesions mapped for participants with depression, i.e. GDS scores from 10 (yellow) to 27 (red). C) VLSM maps calculated for GDS scores of 46 stroke patients. The (uncorrected) cluster includes areas of the medial forebrain bundle (MFB) and the putamen in the left hemisphere.

Whole-brain topology and connectome analysis

One participant had no connections (edges) to the postcentral gyrus due to a lesion in this area. Connectivity matrices for all other participants were fully connected, i.e. all nodes were connected to other nodes.

The subnetwork of reduced FA-weighted connectivity in the D+ group compared to the HC group comprised 47 nodes and 75 edges (see Figure 1). The majority (54%) of affected connections (edges) linked with frontal lobe nodes. The largest between group effect sizes were found in intrinsic connections within the frontal lobes, including between the frontal superior medial gyrus, precentral gyrus and rostral anterior cingulate gyrus. No connections showed significantly increased FA in the D- group compared to the HC group and no group differences in FA were observed between the D- and HC group or between Dand D+ groups. For a display of significant subnetworks across supra-thresholds of 3.5 (corresponding to p = 0.0005) and 4 (corresponding to p = 0.0001) see Supplementary Figure S2.



Figure S2. Networks of significantly reduced FA in the group of patients with post-stroke depression compared to the healthy control group. Connection colour reflects t-statistic magnitude. Subnetworks are significant at $p_{FWE} < 0.05$. A) T-statistic is set to a supra-threshold of 3.5, which corresponds to p = 0.0005. B) T-statistic is set to a supra-threshold of 4, which corresponds to p = 0.0001.

The subnetwork of increased FW-weighted connectivity in the D+ group compared to the HC group (see Figure 1) comprising 56 nodes and 79 edges. The largest between-group effect sizes were again located in intrinsic connections within the frontal lobes, including connections between the precentral gyrus, superiorfrontal gyrus, inferior frontal gyrus (pars triangularis) and rostral anterior cingulate cortex. No connections showed significantly decreased FW in the D+ group compared to the HC group and no group differences in FW were observed between the D- group and the HC group or the D- and D+ groups. For a display of significant subnetworks across supra-thresholds of 3.5 (corresponding to p =0.0005) and 4 (corresponding to p = 0.0001) see Supplementary Figure S3.



Figure S3. Networks of significantly reduced fractional anisotropy (FA) in the group of patients with post-stroke depression compared to the healthy control group. Connection color reflects t-statistic magnitude. Subnetworks are significant at $p_{FWE} < 0.05$. A) T-statistic is set

to a supra-threshold of 3.5, which corresponds to p = 0.0005 B) T-statistic is set to a supra-threshold of 4, which corresponds to p = 0.0001.

Structural group differences in the reward system

Compared to the HC group, the D+ group had significantly reduced FA across regions and hemispheres (t(59) = 2.4, $p_{corr} = 0.045$) and the D- group showed a trend towards reduced overall FA (t(59) = 2.375, $p_{corr} = 0.053$) (see Figure S4).



Figure S4. A) Cingulum bundle subdivisions from one representative participant B) Medial forebrain bundle (MFB) reconstruction from one representative participant C) fractional anisotropy (FA) and free-water (FW) values displayed separately for the healthy control group, as well as the groups of stroke patients without depression (D-) and with depression (D+). *Bonferroni corrected significant (p < .05) difference between groups **Bonferroni corrected significant (p < .05) difference between groups.

A repeated-measures ANCOVA with grey matter volumes did not detect a main effect for group or any significant interactions with group (see Figure S5).



Figure S5. C) Grey matter structures of the reward system and B) grey matter volume (ml) displayed separately for the healthy control group, as well as the groups of stroke patients without depression (D-) and with depression (D+).

Contribution of global topology and measures in the reward system to depression severity

All VIFs in the first regression analysis were below 1.6 (VIF range = 1.01 - 1.58) and all VIFs in the second regression analysis were below 3.2 (VIF range = 2.05 - 3.15), indicating that multicollinearity was not a problem.

References

- 1. Dale AM, Fischl B, Sereno MI. Cortical surface-based analysis. I. Segmentation and surface reconstruction. *Neuroimage* Feb 1999;9(2):179-194.
- 2. Tournier JD, Calamante F, Connelly A. Determination of the appropriate b value and number of gradient directions for high-angular-resolution diffusion-weighted imaging. *NMR Biomed* 2013;26(12):1775-1786.
- **3.** Tournier JD, Calamante F, Connelly A. MRtrix: Diffusion tractography in crossing fiber regions. *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology* 2012;22(1):53-66.
- **4.** Smith RE, Tournier J-D, Calamante F, Connelly A. Anatomically-constrained tractography: Improved diffusion MRI streamlines tractography through effective use of anatomical information. *NeuroImage* 2012/09/01/ 2012;62(3):1924-1938.
- 5. Smith RE, Tournier JD, Calamante F, Connelly A. SIFT: Spherical-deconvolution informed filtering of tractograms. *Neuroimage* Feb 15 2013;67:298-312.
- 6. Pasternak O, Sochen N, Gur Y, Intrator N, Assaf Y. Free water elimination and mapping from diffusion MRI. *Magn Reson Med* 2009;62(3):717-730.
- 7. Russo SJ, Nestler EJ. The brain reward circuitry in mood disorders. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 08/14/online 2013;14:609.
- 8. Zhang W-N, Chang S-H, Guo L-Y, Zhang K-L, Wang J. The neural correlates of reward-related processing in major depressive disorder: A meta-analysis of functional magnetic resonance imaging studies. *J Affect Disord* 2013/11/01/ 2013;151(2):531-539.
- **9.** Keren H, O'Callaghan G, Vidal-Ribas P, et al. Reward Processing in Depression: A Conceptual and Meta-Analytic Review Across fMRI and EEG Studies. *The American journal of psychiatry* 2018;175(11):1111-1120.
- **10.** Geugies H, Mocking RJT, Figueroa CA, et al. Impaired reward-related learning signals in remitted unmedicated patients with recurrent depression. *Brain* Aug 1 2019;142(8):2510-2522.
- 11. Bora E, Fornito A, Pantelis C, Yucel M. Gray matter abnormalities in Major Depressive Disorder: a meta-analysis of voxel based morphometry studies. *J Affect Disord* Apr 2012;138(1-2):9-18.
- **12.** Mitterschiffthaler MT, Kumari V, Malhi GS, et al. Neural response to pleasant stimuli in anhedonia: an fMRI study. *Neuroreport* Feb 10 2003;14(2):177-182.
- **13.** Segarra N, Metastasio A, Ziauddeen H, et al. Abnormal Frontostriatal Activity During Unexpected Reward Receipt in Depression and Schizophrenia: Relationship to Anhedonia. *Neuropsychopharmacology : official publication of the American College of Neuropsychopharmacology* 2016;41(8):2001-2010.

- 14. Ancelin ML, Carriere I, Artero S, Maller J, Meslin C, Ritchie K, Ryan J, Chaudieu I. Lifetime major depression and grey-matter volume. *J Psychiatry Neurosci* Jan 1 2019;44(1):45-53.
- **15.** Campbell S, Marriott M, Nahmias C, MacQueen GM. Lower hippocampal volume in patients suffering from depression: a meta-analysis. *Am J Psychiatry* Apr 2004;161(4):598-607.
- **16.** Geerlings MI, Gerritsen L. Late-Life Depression, Hippocampal Volumes, and Hypothalamic-Pituitary-Adrenal Axis Regulation: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Biol Psychiatry* Sep 1 2017;82(5):339-350.
- **17.** Ballmaier M, Narr KL, Toga AW, et al. Hippocampal morphology and distinguishing late-onset from early-onset elderly depression. *Am J Psychiatry* Feb 2008;165(2):229-237.
- **18.** Pizzagalli DA, Holmes AJ, Dillon DG, et al. Reduced caudate and nucleus accumbens response to rewards in unmedicated individuals with major depressive disorder. *Am J Psychiatry* Jun 2009;166(6):702-710.
- **19.** Epstein J, Pan H, Kocsis JH, et al. Lack of ventral striatal response to positive stimuli in depressed versus normal subjects. *Am J Psychiatry* Oct 2006;163(10):1784-1790.
- **20.** Enneking V, Krussel P, Zaremba D, et al. Social anhedonia in major depressive disorder: a symptom-specific neuroimaging approach. *Neuropsychopharmacology* Apr 2019;44(5):883-889.
- **21.** Forbes EE, Hariri AR, Martin SL, et al. Altered striatal activation predicting realworld positive affect in adolescent major depressive disorder. *Am J Psychiatry* Jan 2009;166(1):64-73.
- **22.** Robinson OJ, Cools R, Carlisi CO, Sahakian BJ, Drevets WC. Ventral striatum response during reward and punishment reversal learning in unmedicated major depressive disorder. *The American journal of psychiatry* 2012;169(2):152-159.
- **23.** Klok MPC, van Eijndhoven PF, Argyelan M, Schene AH, Tendolkar I. Structural brain characteristics in treatment-resistant depression: review of magnetic resonance imaging studies. *BJPsych Open* Sep 2 2019;5(5):e76.
- 24. Dichter GS, Kozink RV, McClernon FJ, Smoski MJ. Remitted major depression is characterized by reward network hyperactivation during reward anticipation and hypoactivation during reward outcomes. *J Affect Disord* Feb 2012;136(3):1126-1134.
- **25.** Rothkirch M, Tonn J, Kohler S, Sterzer P. Neural mechanisms of reinforcement learning in unmedicated patients with major depressive disorder. *Brain* Apr 1 2017;140(4):1147-1157.
- **26.** Metzler-Baddeley C, Jones DK, Steventon J, Westacott L, Aggleton JP, O'Sullivan MJ. Cingulum Microstructure Predicts Cognitive Control in Older Age and Mild Cognitive Impairment. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 2012;32(49):17612-17619.

- 27. Coenen VA, Panksepp J, Hurwitz TA, Urbach H, Madler B. Human medial forebrain bundle (MFB) and anterior thalamic radiation (ATR): imaging of two major subcortical pathways and the dynamic balance of opposite affects in understanding depression. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* Spring 2012;24(2):223-236.
- **28.** Anthofer JM, Steib K, Fellner C, Lange M, Brawanski A, Schlaier J. DTI-based deterministic fibre tracking of the medial forebrain bundle. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* Mar 2015;157(3):469-477.
- **29.** *MATLAB and Statistics Toolbox* [computer program]. Version. Natick, MA: The MathWorks; 2018a.
- **30.** *IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh* [computer program]. Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.; 2017.
- **31.** Zalesky A, Fornito A, Bullmore ET. Network-based statistic: Identifying differences in brain networks. *Neuroimage* 2010/12/01/2010;53(4):1197-1207.