

**Unedited Proof**

***Manuscript Accepted at Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience***

*Please do not distribute before contacting [insel@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:insel@fas.harvard.edu).*

Asymmetric neural tracking of gain and loss magnitude during adolescence

Catherine Insel & Leah H. Somerville

Department of Psychology and Center for Brain Science, Harvard University

52 Oxford Street, Room 290, Cambridge, MA 02138 USA

**Corresponding author:** Catherine Insel; 52 Oxford Street, Room 290, Cambridge, MA 02138

USA; Phone: (617) 496 5447; Fax: (617) 495 0605; Email: [insel@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:insel@fas.harvard.edu)

### **Abstract**

Adolescence has been characterized as a developmental period of heightened reward seeking and attenuated aversive processing. However, it remains unclear how the neural bases of distinct outcome valuation processes shift during this stage of the lifespan. N=74 participants ranging in age from 13 to 20 completed a value-modulated fMRI task in which participants earn low and high magnitude monetary outcomes to test whether gain and loss magnitude tracking—the neural representation of relative value in context—change differentially over this age span. Results revealed that gain and loss magnitude tracking follow asymmetric developmental trajectories. Gain magnitude tracking is elevated in the striatum during early adolescence and then decreases with age. By contrast, loss magnitude tracking in the anterior insula follows a quadratic pattern, undergoing a temporary attenuation during mid-late adolescence. A typical comparison of gain versus loss outcomes (collapsing over magnitude effects) showed robust activity across a suite of brain regions sensitive to value based on prior work including the ventral striatum, but they exhibited no changes with age. These findings suggest that value coding subprocesses follow divergent developmental paths across adolescence, which may contribute to normative shifts in adolescent motivated behavior.

**Keywords:** adolescence, value, reward, loss, striatum, insula

Adolescence is a developmental window characterized by normative changes in motivated behavior. Research using animal models, human behavioral research, and brain imaging work have broadly implicated a remodeling of behaviors and neurobiological signals relevant to valuation and motivation during adolescence (Hartley & Somerville, 2015; Somerville & Casey, 2010; Somerville et al., 2010). For example, adolescents are thought to exhibit heightened approach-related behavior towards rewards and attenuated processing of aversive cues (Doremus-Fitzwater & Spear, 2016). While most prior human neuroimaging research in this area has focused on reactivity to rewarding outcomes, valuation of outcome-related processes extends beyond mere reward reactivity. The present study quantifies a broadened spectrum of neural signals contributing to gain and loss outcome value processing to chart developmental shifts in valuation relevant processing with greater specificity.

Human neuroimaging studies have identified the neural signals associated with gain and loss processing in adults (Delgado, 2007), which provide a framework to consider the development of valuation coding in the brain. Converging evidence has demonstrated that a distributed brain system codes the relative value of gain and loss outcomes (Bartra et al., 2013). The striatum and anterior insula represent key nodes within this valuation system (Knutson et al., 2014). Striatal activity increases with reward magnitude and promotes approach behavior (O'Doherty, 2004), whereas anterior insula activity tracks increasing loss magnitude (Samanez-Larkin et al., 2008) and enhances avoidance behavior (Palminteri et al., 2012). This form of value coding, which we will refer to as magnitude tracking, represents the span of value within a given context (Seymour & McClure, 2008) with parametrically increased neural activity during outcome receipt reflecting increasing context-relative value. Thus, the neural signals of these brain regions do not simply represent the presence of gain or loss, but the relative magnitude of a given outcome compared to available alternatives. While gain and loss magnitude tracking

has been well established in adults (Rangel & Clithero, 2012), it remains unknown whether this form of value signaling changes across development.

Prior work suggests that adolescents exhibit elevated reward reactivity in the striatum relative to younger and older ages (Galvan, 2010; Silverman et al., 2015). Reward reactivity is typically measured by comparing gain to loss outcomes or to baseline, and in tasks that do not include magnitude manipulations (Ernst et al., 2005; Op de Macks et al., 2011; van Duijvenvoorde et al., 2014; Van Leijenhorst et al., 2010), or collapse analyses across levels of value magnitude (Braams et al., 2015; van Leijenhorst et al., 2006). As a result, the developmental trajectory of outcome magnitude tracking remains largely unexplored. Additionally, few studies have examined the development of loss processing independent of reward outcomes. Prior work employing risky decision tasks have focused on neural responses during choice, which involved assessing potential reward and loss information simultaneously (Barkley-Levenson & Galvan, 2014; Barkley-Levenson et al., 2013; van Duijvenvoorde et al., 2015), making it difficult to parse the distinct mechanisms of appetitive and aversive processes. Further, these prior studies focused on decision value at the time of choice, and thus the developmental trajectories of gain and loss outcome processing remain unclear. The current study focused on incentive outcome processes to isolate developmental changes in neural processes that support magnitude tracking for gain and loss processes from conventional comparisons of reward reactivity.

In this study, participants completed a magnitude tracking task while undergoing functional magnetic resonance imaging. The task implemented a stakes manipulation, enabling independent measurement of neural responses to low and high magnitude gain and loss outcomes. In addition, the present study quantified the conventional gain versus loss processing comparison examined in prior work. We also conducted ancillary analyses to address the possibility that any observed age differences could be a byproduct of age-covarying factors such as fMRI data quality or differences in hedonic experience receiving the monetary

incentives. By querying these related, but distinct, neural processes, we can gain a clearer picture of how development shapes neural valuation processes for gain and loss outcomes.

## **Methods**

### **Participants.**

79 participants between the ages of 13 and 20 years took part in this experiment. 74 (38 females; M age = 17.22, standard deviation age = 2.31) participants were included in analyses, and 5 participants were excluded due to excessive in-scanner motion. The proportion of male and female participants did not significantly vary over the age range ( $\chi^2(73)=0.95$ ,  $p=0.81$ ; 13-14: 9 males, 8 females; 15-16: 7 males, 11 females; 17-18: 10 males, 9 females; 19-20: 10 males, 10 females). Participants were screened for past or current psychiatric or neurological illness and had no lifetime use of psychotropic medication. Participants completed the Similarities and Matrix Reasoning sections of the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (Wechsler, 2011). Full-scale IQ was approximated using the age and sex specific t-score conversion (estimated IQ was unavailable for  $n=3$  participants). Estimated IQ did not vary across the age range, as there was no significant association between IQ and age ( $r(69)=0.082$ ,  $p=0.50$ ). The sample included left-handed ( $N=6$ ) and right-handed ( $N=66$ ) individuals, and handedness did not significantly vary by age ( $\chi^2(3)=3.796$ ,  $p=0.28$ ). Before study participation, participants and their legal guardians provided written assent and consent under the protocol approved by the Committee for Use of Human Subjects at Harvard University.

### **Magnitude Tracking Task.**

During functional neuroimaging, participants performed a task in which they received low-magnitude and high-magnitude gain and loss outcomes (Figure 1). This task was based on prior work (Delgado, Locke, Stenger, & Fiez, 2003; Delgado, Nystrom, Fissell, Noll, & Fiez, 2000) with the addition of a magnitude manipulation to compare responses to gains and losses

at two levels of magnitude. First, participants viewed a low-stakes (+20¢/-10¢) or high-stakes (+\$1/-50¢) cue indicating the value of the upcoming four trials. On each trial, participants viewed a card turned over with a “?” and were instructed there was a number on the other side of the card between 1 and 9 (but not 5). Participants were instructed to press one of two buttons, indicating their guess of whether the number was lower than 5 (index finger) or higher than 5 (middle finger). Next, experimentally fixed feedback was displayed indicating whether they were correct (resulting in a monetary gain) or incorrect (resulting in a monetary loss).




Figure 1. Magnitude tracking task. Participants viewed a cue (question mark) indicating they should guess whether the overturned card is greater or less than 5. Participants then received experimentally fixed feedback. The low stakes block, (top) delivers small gains and losses, whereas the high stakes block (bottom) delivers large gains and losses. Each set of four trials is preceded by a cue indicating a forthcoming series of high or low stakes payout trials. This design permits separate comparison of neural response to receipt of gains versus losses (collapsed over stakes), magnitude tracking activity to high versus low gain outcomes, and magnitude tracking of high versus low loss outcomes.

In the high-stakes condition, correct feedback yielded a high-magnitude gain of \$1.00 and incorrect feedback and missed responses incurred a high-magnitude loss of 50¢. In low-stakes, correct feedback yielded a low-magnitude gain of 20¢ and incorrect feedback and missed responses incurred a low-magnitude loss of 10¢. In total, 50% of trials delivered correct feedback with gain outcomes. The magnitude of the gain and loss incentives were chosen to allow for payout of all trials while also including a large number of trials for each condition, which ensured stable estimation of task conditions for the fMRI models. Participants were instructed

that earnings would be paid out in full; however, all participants received \$15 as bonus payment at the end of the study, which was equivalent to the amount a participant could earn if no missed responses occurred. Number of missed responses did not vary by age (average response rate=94.95%, correlation with age:  $r(72)=0.037$ ,  $p=0.76$ ).

The task was presented using PsychoPy software version 1.80 (Peirce, 2007), and displayed on a screen visible through a mirror attached to the head coil. Behavioral responses were collected with a MRI-compatible button box, and all participants used the index and middle finger of their dominant hand to make responses. Gain and loss feedback was pre-determined to include 50% correct (win) outcomes, and feedback presentation was pseudo-randomized within a block and ranged from 1 to 3 correct trials per block. Square frames surrounding trial stimuli (one-line frame for low stakes and two-line frame for high-stakes) differentiated task from rest and provided a constant reminder of stakes conditions to reduce working memory demands.

The task consisted of 24 blocks, which were presented across two functional runs lasting 422 seconds each. The order of low and high stakes blocks was pseudo-randomized within and across runs. Stakes cues were presented for 1 second, guess trials for 1.5 seconds, and feedback/outcome for 1 second. Each block included one cue followed by four guess trials and four feedback/outcome displays. All task events were temporally separated by jittered interstimulus intervals ranging from 1.5 to 3.5 seconds, and 8 seconds of fixation separated each block. In total, the task included 24 stakes cues (12 high stakes/12 low stakes), 96 guess trials (48 high/48 low), and 96 feedback events (24 high win +\$1.00, 24 high loss -\$0.50, 24 low win +\$0.20, 24 low loss -\$0.10).

### **FMRI acquisition and data processing.**

Participants were scanned on a Siemens 3.0T Tim Trio scanner with a 32-channel head coil. Anatomical data were acquired with a high-resolution, T1-weighted anatomical scan using a multiecho multiplanar rapidly acquired gradient-echo (MEMPRAGE) sequence (repetition

time=2530 msec., echo time=1.74, 3.59, 5.44, 7.29 msec., flip angle=7°, field of view=212 mm, slice thickness=1mm, voxel size=1x1x1 mm) that is robust to head motion (Tisdall et al., 2012). fMRI BOLD activity was measured over two functional runs. Functional data were acquired with a T2\*-weighted EPI sequence with the following parameters: repetition time=2 sec., echo time=30 msec., field of view=216 mm, flip angle=90°, voxel size=3x3x3 mm. Thirty-one slices aligned to the anterior to posterior commissure plane were acquired per TR, with a slice thickness of 3.75 mm. Prospective acquisition correction for head motion (PACE) (Thesen et al., 2000) was implemented during functional scans to reduce motion-induced corruption of signal.

fMRI data processing and analysis were conducted with FSL (version 5.0.4) (Smith et al., 2004). Preprocessing was conducted in FSL and implemented through the Lyman pipeline (v.0.0.7, <https://github.com/mwaskom>), which relies on the Nipype project framework (v. 0.9.2) (Gorgolewski et al., 2011). Standard preprocessing steps included slice-time correction, realignment, coregistration of functional to structural images using `bbregister` (Greve & Fischl, 2009), non-linear normalization of structural to FSL's MNI152 template space using ANTS 1.9.x, svn release 891; (Avants et al., 2009), and spatial smoothing with a 6mm Gaussian kernel.

Functional MRI data were carefully evaluated for motion and signal outliers given the negative impact it can have on signal quality and GLM estimates. 5 participants were excluded from analysis due to motion or data quality. The following rules were imposed for exclusion of functional data. Runs in which more than 10% of TRs were censored for motion (relative motion > 1mm) or outlier signal intensity (exceeded the grand run median by 4.5 median absolute deviations) were excluded from analysis. Runs with a single relative movement exceeding 5 mm were also excluded. Participants with one usable run (n=4) were included in analysis. In total, five participants were completely excluded for excessive motion (average age of excluded participants was 16.57, range 14.24 – 17.71). In the full inclusion sample, there was no relationship between age and percent of censored data as measured by proportion of volumes excluded from analysis ( $r(72)=-0.068$ ,  $p=0.56$ ).

**Self-reported ratings.**

In a post-test, participants provided self-reported valence and arousal ratings for the task stimuli and monetary outcomes to assess for potential, co-occurring age differences in the hedonic experience of receiving the specific amounts of money used in the task. Ratings were collected using the Self-Assessment Manikin scales for valence and arousal (Lang, 1980). Valence ratings were given on a scale from 1 (unpleasant) to 9 (pleasant). Arousal ratings were scored on a scale from 1 (low arousal) to 9 (high arousal).

Analyses for the stimuli and hedonic experience ratings were implemented with linear mixed effects models using the nlme package in R (Pinheiro et al., 2014) and included factors for magnitude (high/low) and valence (gain/loss). Models for arousal and valence ratings were conducted separately. Models included self-reported rating as the dependent variable, magnitude (high/low) and valence (gain/loss) as fixed effects, and subject as a random effect. To evaluate whether hedonic experience ratings were consistent with age, linear and nonlinear predictors of age were fit using the poly function and added as predictors to each model. A linear age predictor identified differences that increased or decreased with age, whereas a quadratic age predictor identified trajectories that peaked (inverted-U shape) or troughed (U-shape) during adolescence. The quadratic age predictor peaked at 17.22 years in this sample, very similar to the peak age of reward reactivity (gain versus loss contrast) reported in Braams et al (2015). Model fits for linear and quadratic age predictors were compared using the anova function in R to determine whether the added age terms improved model fit. Together, these analyses isolated effects of valence (gain/loss), magnitude (high/low), their interaction, and interactions with age on hedonic experience.

**FMRI analysis.**

Preprocessed BOLD data were submitted to a general linear model (GLM) analysis using film\_gls in FSL (Smith et al., 2004) to estimate relevant task effects. Regressors of interest included temporal onsets for the following task events: low-stakes cues, high-stakes

cues, low-magnitude gains, high-magnitude gains, low-magnitude losses, and high-magnitude losses. Additional regressors of non-interest modeled the choice period of trials with a single regressor modeling all guesses, and a second regressor modeling all missed-responses. All task regressors were convolved with the canonical hemodynamic response function. Nuisance regressors included 6-parameter motion correction and censored frames for deviant signal intensity and excessive motion. This model achieved uniformly low colinearity across regressors of interest (range:  $r=-0.19-0.21$ ).

Random-effects group analyses (whole-brain voxelwise t-tests) were conducted to identify task-based changes in functional activity. The design of the task allowed for separate quantification of gain and loss magnitude tracking responses. Gain magnitude tracking was measured by comparing functional activity to high-magnitude versus low-magnitude rewards ( $+\$1 > +20\phi$ ). Loss magnitude tracking was measured by comparing functional activity to high-magnitude versus low-magnitude losses ( $-50\phi > -10\phi$ ). Reward reactivity was measured by comparing all gains to all losses, collapsing over magnitude ( $[\$1 \& +20\phi] > [-50\phi \& -10\phi]$ ).

For these contrasts of interest, we first conducted analyses to identify neural regions responsive to gain and loss magnitude tracking in the whole sample, using one-sample t-tests. To assess age-related differences in brain activity for gain and loss magnitude tracking, mean-centered linear and quadratic age regressors were entered as covariates in the whole brain analyses just described. Whole brain maps were thresholded using whole-brain correction of  $z>2.3$  using FLAME 1+2, as implemented in FSL, resulting in whole-brain threshold of  $p<0.05$  family-wise error (FWE) corrected. Analyses implementing an initial threshold of  $z>2.3$  identified several large clusters spanning across many anatomical regions. Therefore, to better isolate distinct regions and delineate anatomical boundaries, we re-ran group analyses using a more stringent initial threshold of  $z>3$  before submitting maps to whole brain correction (FWE  $p<0.05$ ). Results from both analyses are reported in the cluster tables.

Significant age effects identified in the activation maps were supplemented with descriptive plotting of neural response by age to visualize the directionality of effects. To do so, we extracted parameter estimates from the activation loci using a 6mm sphere around the peak activated voxel for cortical regions or the full activated cluster for subcortical regions. Upon examining the linear age fit for the gain magnitude tracking (high>low reward) contrast, a notable outlier was detected that facilitated the statistical significance of the results. We verified that this participant was a highly influential data point based on a Cook's distance value that was greater than three times the mean distance (Stevens, 1984), which raised concern that the single data point may have skewed the results in a way that was not representative of the age-related trend. Therefore, we re-computed the statistical activation maps after removing this outlier (new analysis sample size  $n=73$ ), and the results reported for this analysis reflect the smaller sample size.

Post-hoc exploratory analyses were performed using small volume correction to further interrogate potential developmental trends that did not survive whole brain correction. The striatum was selected as a region of interest for these post-hoc exploratory analyses given that the striatum serves a key role in valuation signaling (Bartra et al., 2013; Delgado, 2007; Liu et al., 2011), and adolescence has been previously characterized by increased striatal activity during reward outcome processing (Braams et al., 2015; Silverman et al., 2015). We generated an anatomically defined striatum mask consisting of the bilateral caudate, putamen, and nucleus accumbens masks from the Harvard-Oxford atlas, thresholded at 10% probability (Desikan et al., 2006). We then queried for activations within this mask using small volume correction (SVC) thresholding by implementing threshold free cluster enhancement (TFCE) through the randomise function in FSL (Smith & Nichols, 2009), a conservative thresholding approach that eliminates the need to set an arbitrary threshold for initial cluster formation. TFCE was conducted with 5,000 permutations, resulting in small volume threshold of  $p<0.05$  family-wise error (FWE) corrected.

Cluster peaks are reported in cluster tables for the whole brain corrected maps reflecting a FWE  $p < 0.05$  corrected threshold. Region labels are based on the Harvard-Oxford Cortical and Subcortical Atlases. Sub-clusters were defined by local maxima (activation peaks) within each cluster using a higher-values-first watershed searching algorithm, implemented in the Lyman pipeline (<https://github.com/mwaskom>).

## Results

### **Loss Magnitude Tracking.**

Whole-brain analyses in the full sample identified a set of brain regions that exhibited enhanced recruitment for high-magnitude relative to low-magnitude losses ( $-50¢ > -10¢$  contrast). Results revealed that participants exhibited loss magnitude tracking in the right insula, right frontal pole, right middle frontal gyrus, bilateral cingulate, and bilateral thalamus (Figure 2a, Table 1a).

Next, whole-brain linear and quadratic age analyses were computed to identify age-modulated loss scaling activity. No regions' activity surpassed whole brain correction for linear age or for the quadratic inverted-U model. For the quadratic age U-shaped model that troughed in mid-adolescence, we observed significant activity in the right anterior insula (1118 voxels at  $X=42, Y=12, Z=6$ ) extending into the operculum, right precentral gyrus, and right middle frontal gyrus (Figure 2b, Table 1b). Descriptive plotting of the age interaction in the anterior insula confirmed that differential activity for high  $>$  low magnitude losses was highest in the youngest and oldest participants, and attenuated during mid-late adolescence (Figure 2c for visualization purposes).




Figure 2. A) Whole-brain analysis identifying neural regions exhibiting loss magnitude tracking (e.g., greater response to high than low value losses) in the full sample. B) Neural regions demonstrating age-related change following a quadratic pattern. C) Parameter estimates from right insula (Fig. 2B) for high > low loss contrast reveals attenuation of loss magnitude tracking in adolescence. This plot is shown for descriptive purposes only.

### Gain Magnitude Tracking.

To measure gain magnitude tracking, whole brain analyses identified regions exhibiting enhanced recruitment for high-magnitude relative to low-magnitude gains (+\$1 > +20¢). Gain

magnitude tracking was associated with recruitment in the bilateral ventral striatum (nucleus accumbens) and dorsal striatum (caudate) extending into the thalamus, insula, frontal pole, cingulate, precuneus, and precentral gyrus (Figure 3a, Table 2).

For the age covariate analyses, no regions survived whole brain thresholding for either linear or quadratic age predictors. Given hypotheses regarding the role of the striatum in reward valuation, additional exploratory analyses were conducted within a striatum mask (containing the caudate, putamen and nucleus accumbens) with small volume correction (see Methods for correction and outlier detection information). The linear age analysis revealed that within the striatum, there was greater gain magnitude tracking (i.e., differential recruitment for high relative to low magnitude rewards) in younger participants that decreased with increasing age in a circumscribed region within right caudate (17 voxels at X=10, Y=24, Z=-2; Figure 3b and 3c, for visualization purposes only).




Figure 3. A) Whole-brain analysis identifying neural regions exhibiting gain magnitude tracking (e.g., greater response to high than low value gains) in the full sample. B) Neural regions demonstrating age-related change following a linear pattern, queried within a mask of the striatum ( $p < 0.05$ , TFCE small volume correction). C) Parameter estimates from the caudate (Fig. 3B) for high > low gain contrast reveals exaggerated gain magnitude tracking in early adolescence. This plot is shown for descriptive purposes only.

### Reward Reactivity.

Similar to existing work, reward reactivity was measured by comparing activity that increased for gains relative to losses ( $[+\$1 \ \& \ +20\phi] > [-50\phi \ \& \ -10\phi]$ ). This comparison was associated with enhanced recruitment of the ventral striatum (nucleus accumbens), dorsal striatum (caudate and putamen), cingulate, orbitofrontal cortex and precuneus (Figure 4A, Table 3). No regions survived whole brain corrected thresholds in contrasts targeting age-related changes in gain versus loss activity following the linear or quadratic age patterns.

#### A. Reward Reactivity: Gain vs. Loss Outcome





Figure 4. A) Whole-brain analysis identifying neural regions exhibiting reward reactivity (e.g., greater response to gain than loss feedback) in the full sample. B) Region of interest analysis confirming lack of age differences on the ventral striatum response to gain versus loss contrast. The right ventral striatum is depicted for visualization purposes, although the left ventral striatum is equivalently flat.

#### B. Striatum Reward Reactivity across Age



Although we did not observe any differential age-related responses to gain versus loss in whole brain analyses, we followed up with an exploratory ROI analysis focused on the striatum

to query for even subtle effects, given prior work suggesting that reward reactivity peaks in mid-late adolescence (Braams et al., 2015). We used a watershed technique to identify the sub-peak activations within the boundaries of the left and right ventral striatum in the gain > loss analysis. We then extracted parameter estimates from these regions (left: 22 voxels at X=-12, Y=8, Z=-6; right: 18 voxels at X=12, Y=10, Z=-4); and plotted each ROI by age for visualization purposes. Visual inspection of both plots confirmed that there was no visible relationship with age (Figure 4B, right ventral striatum is depicted, although the left ventral striatum exhibits an equivalently flat age pattern).

### **Hedonic Experience Ratings.**

To verify that hedonic experience of the low and high magnitude gain and loss outcomes was consistent with age, participants provided self-reported valence (1 unpleasant to 9 pleasant) and arousal (1 low arousal to 9 high arousal) ratings for the task cues and incentive outcomes. For the cues, participants rated the cue denoting high stakes as significantly more positive (high stakes: M=5.89, SD=1.26; low stakes: M=4.95, SD=1.16) and more arousing (high stakes: M=3.91, SD=1.98; low stakes: M=2.45, SD=1.62) than low stakes cues (see Table 5). Participants rated high magnitude gains as significantly more positive (high gain: M=7.18, SD=1.15; low gain: M=6.23, SD=0.90) and arousing (high rewards: M=4.98, SD=1.91; low rewards: M=3.62, SD=1.59) than low magnitude gains. Finally, participants rated high magnitude losses as significantly more negative (high losses: M=2.37, SD=1.19; low losses: M=3.09, SD=1.10) and more arousing than low magnitude losses (high losses: M=4.05, SD=1.83; low losses: M=2.70, SD=1.66). Valence and arousal ratings did not interact with linear or quadratic age trajectories for any of these classes of ratings. These analyses build confidence that the differences in gain and loss magnitude tracking cannot be explained by systematic age-related differences in hedonic experience when receiving money.

### Discussion

The aim of this study was to identify how multiple neural valuation processes change across adolescence. During fMRI, we evaluated different facets of outcome valuation in adolescent and young adult participants age 13 to 20 by examining neural responses to gain and loss magnitude tracking in addition to analyses of reward reactivity. Results showed that distinct value representations followed asymmetric age-related change in patterns of neural recruitment within canonical valuation circuitry. Gain magnitude tracking decreased with age such that younger adolescents exhibited exaggerated magnitude tracking in the dorsal striatum for high relative to low gain outcomes compared to later ages. By contrast, loss magnitude tracking showed a quadratic effect of age in anterior insula response, with a significant drop during mid-adolescence. Reward reactivity analyses, which compared gain and loss outcomes while collapsing across low and high magnitudes, revealed no effect of age, suggesting that all ages increased striatal responses to gain relative to loss outcomes similarly. Together, these findings suggest that neurodevelopment exerts differential influence on distinct components of outcome valuation, which could be relevant to a variety of behavioral features that undergo normative change during this developmental window.

Magnitude tracking analyses isolated neural signals representing high-value relative to low-value outcomes. In the loss domain, across the group, a broad network of regions exhibited increased activation for high loss outcomes, including the insula, cingulate and thalamus. This pattern of recruitment converges with prior studies in adults examining the neural mechanisms supporting loss valuation (Bartra et al., 2013; Pessiglione & Delgado, 2015). Quadratic age analyses revealed that loss magnitude tracking was maximally attenuated during mid-adolescence in the anterior insula, suggesting that loss magnitude tracking may undergo a temporary period of attenuation during adolescence. Loss-related processing in the anterior insula has been linked to avoidance learning from punishments (Palminteri et al., 2012; Samanez-Larkin et al., 2008), suggesting that insula activity may subserve the ability to use

negative outcomes to incrementally update value representations. Though future work is needed to elucidate the behavioral consequences of this trajectory, it stimulates hypotheses about whether attenuated loss value processing is a key mechanism that contributes to adolescents' tendency toward risky decision making (Defoe et al., 2015; Figner et al., 2009; Powers et al., in press) and altered learning from or sensitivity to negative feedback (Rodman et al., 2017; van den Bos et al., 2012; van Duijvenvoorde et al., 2008).

Gain magnitude tracking analyses separately identified regions exhibiting enhanced activation for high relative to low value gain outcomes. Across the group, there was increased recruitment in the bilateral ventral striatum, caudate, thalamus, insula, cingulate, and medial prefrontal cortex, a suite of brain regions commonly identified as a reward valuation network (Bartra et al., 2013; Delgado, 2007; Haber & Knutson, 2010; Liu et al., 2011). Age comparisons indicated that activity in these regions were largely consistent across age, converging with prior developmental work assessing high compared to low value outcomes (Insel et al., 2017). The sole exception was elevated gain magnitude tracking in the caudate in early adolescence that decreased progressively with increasing age.

Prior work suggests that adolescents exhibit heightened magnitude tracking in the ventral striatum compared to young adults when computing the expected value of a choice during risky decisions and also when passively receiving high versus low magnitude rewards (Barkley-Levenson & Galvan, 2014; Galvan et al., 2006). However, it is important to note that this prior work interrogated age differences using a ventral striatum ROI, rather than more broadly across the striatum or whole brain. Here we identified age-related changes in gain magnitude tracking in the dorsal striatum. Notably, research using a whole-brain analysis approach has demonstrated that in the context of a reinforcement learning task, adolescents exhibit elevated reward prediction error coding in the dorsal striatum at the time of reward feedback (outcome stage) relative to children and adults (Cohen et al., 2010). The striatum is a heterogeneous region with diverse functional roles (Haber & Knutson, 2010), and therefore it

will be important for future work to consider striatal “hyperresponding” in adolescence with greater anatomical specificity. Moreover, the elevation in dorsal striatal response in young adolescents observed here did not survive whole brain correction but was found in a very constrained cluster when implementing small volume correction using a striatal mask. The current findings suggest that age-related gain magnitude tracking biases in the striatum are modest.

These age-related patterns of neural magnitude tracking were not confounded by age-related differences in hedonic experience for winning and losing money. If participants in a certain age range reported a greater or lesser hedonic response to money, this would present an interpretational confound for the observed age effects (Davidow et al., in press). We found no evidence for age-related differences in the relative valence or arousal of low and high gains or low and high losses. This builds confidence in interpreting these signal differences as age-related, rather than experiential.

An open question is whether different developmental trends in magnitude tracking would emerge if even higher magnitude gains and losses were at stake. Converging evidence suggests that outcome value is represented in a relative fashion, and brain activity tracks a relative difference from the potential best and worst options one could experience in a given context (Seymour & McClure, 2008). While this task compared gains of 20¢ and \$1, we believe that these effects would generalize to various magnitudes with similar relative value in low and high stakes (e.g. \$1 vs. \$5 or \$2 vs. \$10). However, future work is needed to assess how larger ratios of high to low stakes incentives (e.g. 20¢ vs. \$10) may impact developmental differences. Further, the developmental trajectories of outcome processing may differ from age-related differences in incentive anticipation or choice value computation. Future work should examine how these distinct subcomponents of valuation may vary across adolescence.

A key feature of the present design is the ability to separate the magnitude tracking responses just described from the more canonical assessments of reward reactivity which

isolate neural signals with greater response to gains than losses. In the present study, reward reactivity was assessed by comparing gain to loss outcomes and collapsing across magnitude conditions. Across the sample, there was robust increased recruitment for gains in the ventral striatum, caudate, putamen, medial prefrontal cortex, and posterior cingulate, converging with prior studies of adults examining the neural bases of reward processing (Delgado, 2007; Delgado et al., 2000).

Surprisingly, there was no effect of age on the reward reactivity response in any of these regions, even when specifically targeting the ventral striatum with constrained ROI analyses. This is inconsistent with prior developmental work suggesting that striatal reward reactivity peaks during mid-adolescence (Braams et al., 2015; Galvan, 2010; Silverman et al., 2015) and theoretical accounts proposing that adolescents are hypersensitive to rewards writ-large. While we found no effect of age on reward reactivity, this may potentially reflect a constrained age range, as other work has tested a wider developmental span extending earlier into childhood and later into young adulthood. For example, Braams et al. (2015) reported a peak in reward activity around age 17 when testing a sample range of 8 to 27 years old. That said, this study joins several others in their failure to identify adolescent-elevated reward reactivity in the ventral striatum (Forbes et al., 2010; May et al., 2004). This could suggest that developmental trends in reward processing are subtler than previously appreciated (Sherman et al., 2017).

Our findings also suggest that attenuated sensitivity to loss magnitude could inadvertently influence statistical comparisons of gain versus loss where loss reflects the baseline condition, since reward valuation signals are largely considered to be coded in the brain relative to the dynamic range of outcome values available in a given environment (Seymour & McClure, 2008). Further, the current task is designed with higher magnitude gain than loss outcomes to mitigate the potential influence of prospect theory (e.g. the phenomenon that losses loom larger than gains, and therefore a loss of 50 cents may hold larger unsigned value than a gain of 50 cents) (Delgado, 2007; Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). Therefore, each

trial has a positive expected value in an absolute sense, even though reward and loss is believed to be more balanced in a subjective sense. However, in other reward reactivity tasks that do not follow the principles of prospect theory, losses could differentially “anchor” value scaling responses and interact differently given mid-adolescents’ attenuation of loss scaling. These findings suggest that more work will be needed to characterize the specificity and boundaries of adolescent neural reward reactivity.

Together, these findings suggest that adolescence is characterized by a temporary attenuation in loss magnitude tracking and an early sensitization to gain magnitude tracking. The combination of these distinct trajectories may, in part, shape normative shifts in adolescent motivated behavior. The present results comport with converging animal studies, which have demonstrated that the adolescent stage is accompanied by reduced behavioral sensitization to punishment. For example, juvenile rodents experience attenuated responses to aversive stimuli, such as decreased sensitivity to the negative effects of alcohol exposure or drug-related withdrawal symptoms (Doremus-Fitzwater & Spear, 2016). Moreover, adolescent-stage rodents have difficulty learning from aversive feedback relative to younger and older ages, and this stage is accompanied by a temporary suppression of behavioral reactions to aversive contexts, which recovers in early adulthood (Pattwell et al., 2011; Pattwell et al., 2012; Pattwell et al., 2016). The current loss magnitude tracking results converge with work in non-human animal models of development and provide evidence for the human neurodevelopmental changes that support attenuated aversive processing, which could result in reduced avoidance behavior during this period of the lifespan. This work highlights attenuated loss processing as a key facet of adolescent motivational change.

In sum, the present study revealed asymmetric neurodevelopmental shifts in distinct outcome valuation processes. This study employed an experimental paradigm capable of separately isolating changes in gain versus loss processing (reward reactivity), gain magnitude tracking, and loss magnitude tracking in a sample of healthy 13-20 year olds. Results indicated

that loss magnitude tracking in the insula exhibits a temporary decrease in mid-adolescence while gain magnitude tracking in the striatum is heightened in early stages but then declines with age. More generally, this work demonstrates that the manner in which valuation-related processes is queried exerts a strong influence on the developmental profiles observed, guiding future work toward charting the development of valuation processes with greater specificity. Future work should investigate how asymmetric gain and loss valuation trajectories influence motivated goal directed behavior.

**Table 1. Regions Exhibiting Increased Activity for Loss Magnitude Tracking**

<i>Table 1.1: Loss Magnitude Tracking</i>					
<b>High&gt;Low Loss Outcome #</b>					
<b>Region</b>	<b>z-stat</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>y</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>voxels</b>
Paracingulate Gyrus	5.3	8	40	20	1057
Paracingulate Gyrus	4.76	2	22	46	
Intracalcarine Cortex	4.9	10	-84	6	828
Cerebellum	3.83	-34	-68	-50	
Insular Cortex	5.8	32	22	0	682
Middle Frontal Gyrus	4.64	48	32	32	
Frontal Pole	4.25	28	52	-4	
Superior Frontal Gyrus	3.58	26	8	54	
Lateral Occipital Cortex	4.42	30	-72	46	644
Supramarginal Gyrus	3.27	50	-40	50	
Cerebellum	5.34	-10	-72	-28	538
<b>Low&gt;High Loss Outcome *</b>					
<b>Region</b>	<b>z-stat</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>y</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>voxels</b>
Precuneus Cortex	6.49	-4	-56	24	11003
Postcentral Gyrus	5.71	38	-24	54	
Postcentral Gyrus	5.5	62	-8	36	
Lateral Occipital Corte	5.17	-50	-72	24	1293
Central Operculum Cortex	5.15	-60	-18	12	3673
Planum Temporale	5.17	62	-12	6	
Hippocampus	4.81	-28	-20	-14	580
Medial Frontal Cortex	4.25	-2	42	-14	447
<i>Table 1.2: Loss Magnitude Tracking Age Analyses</i>					
<b>High&gt;Low Loss with linear increasing age **: no regions</b>					
<b>High&gt;Low Loss with linear decreasing age **: no regions</b>					
<b>High&gt;Low Loss with quadratic <math>\cap</math> age **: no regions</b>					
<b>High&gt;Low Loss with quadratic U age #</b>					
<b>Region</b>	<b>z-stat</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>y</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>Voxels</b>
Precentral Gyrus	4.29	18	-30	64	1205
Supplementary Motor Cortex	3.67	-4	-4	70	
Middle Frontal Gyrus	3.55	38	0	60	
Insula/Frontal Operculum Cortex	3.75	42	12	6	1118
Superior Temporal Gyrus	2.33	44	-20	-6	
<b>Low&gt;High Loss with linear increasing age **: no regions</b>					
<b>Low&gt;High Loss with linear decreasing age **: no regions</b>					
<b>Low&gt;High Loss with quadratic <math>\cap</math> age **: no regions</b>					
<b>Low&gt;High Loss with quadratic U age **: no regions</b>					

Threshold  $p < 0.05$  FWE corrected, with initial Z threshold of 3, denoted by \*. For contrasts with no regions observed, the analysis was repeated with threshold of  $p < 0.05$  FWE corrected, with initial Z threshold of 2.3, denoted by #.

**Table 2. Regions Exhibiting Increased Activity for Gain Magnitude Tracking**

<i>Table 2.1: Gain Magnitude Tracking Group Map</i>					
<b>High&gt;Low Gain Outcome *</b>					
<b>Region</b>	<b>z-stat</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>y</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>Voxels</b>
Paracingulate Gyrus	6.63	10	40	20	11389
Insular Cortex	6.26	28	18	-8	
Frontal Pole	5.66	40	40	36	
Thalamus	5.61	4	-12	10	
Superior Frontal Gyrus	5.46	4	26	48	
Frontal Pole	4.81	20	54	-8	
Cerebellum	5.93	-24	-66	-30	5385
Occipital Pole	5.16	-4	-96	0	
Cerebellum	4.54	36	-62	-28	
Angular Gyrus	5.39	38	-54	36	1375
Insular Cortex	5.8	-28	22	-6	648
Precentral Gyrus	4.66	-36	0	38	474
<b>Low&gt;High Gain Outcome *</b>					
<b>Region</b>	<b>z-stat</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>y</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>voxels</b>
Postcentral Gyrus	5.15	12	-36	54	3018
Supplementary Motor Area	4.7	-10	-14	50	
Precentral Gyrus	4.62	60	2	10	
Central Operculum Cortex	5.41	-52	-4	8	2053
Parietal Operculum Cortex	5.38	44	-22	22	1457
Postcentral Gyrus	4.24	-52	-22	42	388
<i>Table 2.2: Gain Magnitude Tracking Age Analyses</i>					
<b>High&gt;Low Gain with linear increasing age **</b> : no regions					
<b>High&gt;Low Gain with linear decreasing age **</b> : no regions					
<b>High&gt;Low Gain with quadratic <math>\cap</math> age **</b> : no regions					
<b>High&gt;Low Gain with quadratic U age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Low&gt;High Gain with linear increasing age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Low&gt;High Gain with linear decreasing age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Low&gt;High Gain with quadratic <math>\cap</math> age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Low&gt;High Gain with quadratic U age **</b> : no regions					

Threshold  $p < 0.05$  FWE corrected, with initial Z threshold of 3, denoted by \*. For contrasts with no regions observed, the analysis was repeated with threshold of  $p < 0.05$  FWE corrected, with initial Z threshold of 2.3, denoted by #.

**Table 3. Regions Exhibiting Increased Activity for Gain versus Loss Reactivity**

<i>Table 3.1: Reward Reactivity Group Map</i>					
<b>Gain&gt;Loss *</b>					
<b>Region</b>	<b>z-stat</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>y</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>voxels</b>
Caudate	9.59	12	10	-4	98538
Cingulate Gyrus	7.67	-4	-34	38	
Paracingulate Gyrus	7.23	4	50	4	
Cerebellum	7.09	42	-66	-38	
Frontal Orbital Cortex	6.54	-26	34	-10	
Precentral Gyrus	6.42	-14	-26	66	
<b>Loss&gt;Gain **</b> : no regions					
<i>Table 3.2: Reward Reactivity Age Analyses</i>					
<b>Gain&gt;Loss with linear increasing age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Gain&gt;Loss with linear decreasing age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Gain&gt;Loss with quadratic <math>\cap</math> age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Gain&gt;Loss with quadratic U age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Loss&gt;Gain with linear increasing age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Loss&gt;Gain with linear decreasing age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Loss&gt;Gain with quadratic <math>\cap</math> age **</b> : no regions					
<b>Loss&gt;Gain with quadratic U age **</b> : no regions					

Threshold  $p < 0.05$  FWE corrected, with initial Z threshold of 3, denoted by \*. For contrasts with no regions observed, the analysis was repeated with threshold of  $p < 0.05$  FWE corrected, with initial Z threshold of 2.3, denoted by #.

**Table 4. Hedonic Experience Rating Analysis**

	<b>Valence</b>			<b>Arousal</b>		
	<b>b</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>Stakes Cues</b>						
Magnitude	0.95	6.04	<.0001	1.45	7.02	<.0001
Linear Age	1.63	0.95	0.34	-3.89	-1.52	0.13
Quadratic Age	0.61	0.36	0.72	-2.93	-1.15	0.26
Magnitude * Linear Age	-0.72	-0.38	0.71	1.70	0.68	0.50
Magnitude* Quadratic Age	1.09	0.57	0.57	1.86	0.74	0.46
<b>Gain Outcomes</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
Magnitude	0.95	5.84	<.0001	1.36	9.32	<.0001
Linear Age	0.87	0.59	0.55	-3.29	-1.33	0.19
Quadratic Age	-1.72	-1.18	0.24	-2.32	-0.94	0.35
Magnitude * Linear Age	-1.94	-0.99	0.33	0.67	0.38	0.71
Magnitude * Quadratic Age	-0.45	-0.23	0.82	-0.71	-0.40	0.69
<b>Loss Outcomes</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
Magnitude	-0.72	-6.37	<.0001	1.35	7.83	<.0001
Linear Age	3.83	2.41	0.02	-2.56	-1.03	0.31
Quadratic Age	-0.01	-0.01	0.99	-2.05	-0.82	0.41
Magnitude * Linear Age	-0.50	-0.37	0.71	0.74	0.35	0.73
Magnitude * Quadratic Age	0.95	0.69	0.49	0.12	0.06	0.95

### Acknowledgments

We thank Chiemeka Ezie, Megan Garrad, Catherine Glenn, Eliza Lanzillo, Kristen Osborne, Stephanie Sasse, and Constanza Vidal Bustamante for assistance with recruitment and testing. This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (Graduate Research Fellowship DGE 1144152 to C.I.; CAREER grant BCS 1452530 to L.H.S.), the Sackler Scholar Programme in Psychobiology (to C.I.), and the FJ McGuigan Young Investigator Prize for Understanding the Human Mind (to L.H.S.).

## References

- Avants, B. B., Tustison, N., & Song, G. (2009). Advanced normalization tools (ANTS). *Insight j*, 2, 1-35.
- Barkley-Levenson, E., & Galvan, A. (2014). Neural representation of expected value in the adolescent brain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 111(4), 1646-1651.
- Barkley-Levenson, E., Van Leijenhorst, L., & Galvan, A. (2013). Behavioral and neural correlates of loss aversion and risk avoidance in adolescents and adults. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*, 3, 72-83.
- Bartra, O., McGuire, J. T., & Kable, J. W. (2013). The valuation system: a coordinate-based meta-analysis of BOLD fMRI experiments examining neural correlates of subjective value. *Neuroimage*, 76, 412-427.
- Braams, B. R., van Duijvenvoorde, A. C., Peper, J. S., & Crone, E. A. (2015). Longitudinal changes in adolescent risk-taking: a comprehensive study of neural responses to rewards, pubertal development, and risk-taking behavior. *J Neurosci*, 35(18), 7226-7238.
- Cohen, J. R., Asarnow, R. F., Sabb, F. W., Bilder, R. M., Bookheimer, S. Y., Knowlton, B. J., & Poldrack, R. A. (2010). A unique adolescent response to reward prediction errors. *Nat Neurosci*, 13(6), 669-671.
- Davidow, J. Y., Insel, C., & Somerville, L. H. (in press). Adolescent development of value guided goal pursuit. *Trends Cogn Sci*.
- Defoe, I. N., Dubas, J. S., Figner, B., & van Aken, M. A. (2015). A meta-analysis on age differences in risky decision making: adolescents versus children and adults. *Psychol Bull*, 141(1), 48-84.
- Delgado, M. R. (2007). Reward-related responses in the human striatum. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*, 1104, 70-88.
- Delgado, M. R., Nystrom, L. E., Fissell, C., Noll, D. C., & Fiez, J. A. (2000). Tracking the hemodynamic responses to reward and punishment in the striatum. *J Neurophysiol*, 84(6), 3072-3077.
- Desikan, R. S., Segonne, F., Fischl, B., Quinn, B. T., Dickerson, B. C., Blacker, D., Buckner, R. L., Dale, A. M., Maguire, R. P., Hyman, B. T., Albert, M. S., & Killiany, R. J. (2006). An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *Neuroimage*, 31(3), 968-980.

- Doremus-Fitzwater, T. L., & Spear, L. P. (2016). Reward-centricity and attenuated aversions: An adolescent phenotype emerging from studies in laboratory animals. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*, *70*, 121-134.
- Ernst, M., Nelson, E. E., Jazbec, S., McClure, E. B., Monk, C. S., Leibenluft, E., Blair, J., & Pine, D. S. (2005). Amygdala and nucleus accumbens in responses to receipt and omission of gains in adults and adolescents. *Neuroimage*, *25*(4), 1279-1291.
- Figner, B., Mackinlay, R. J., Wilkening, F., & Weber, E. U. (2009). Affective and deliberative processes in risky choice: age differences in risk taking in the Columbia Card Task. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn*, *35*(3), 709-730.
- Forbes, E. E., Ryan, N. D., Phillips, M. L., Manuck, S. B., Worthman, C. M., Moyles, D. L., Tarr, J. A., Sciarrillo, S. R., & Dahl, R. E. (2010). Healthy adolescents' neural response to reward: associations with puberty, positive affect, and depressive symptoms. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*, *49*(2), 162-172 e161-165.
- Galvan, A. (2010). Adolescent development of the reward system. *Front Hum Neurosci*, *4*, 6.
- Galvan, A., Hare, T. A., Parra, C. E., Penn, J., Voss, H., Glover, G., & Casey, B. J. (2006). Earlier development of the accumbens relative to orbitofrontal cortex might underlie risk-taking behavior in adolescents. *J Neurosci*, *26*(25), 6885-6892.
- Gorgolewski, K., Burns, C. D., Madison, C., Clark, D., Halchenko, Y. O., Waskom, M. L., & Ghosh, S. S. (2011). Nipype: a flexible, lightweight and extensible neuroimaging data processing framework in python. *Front Neuroinform*, *5*, 13.
- Greve, D. N., & Fischl, B. (2009). Accurate and robust brain image alignment using boundary-based registration. *Neuroimage*, *48*(1), 63-72.
- Haber, S. N., & Knutson, B. (2010). The reward circuit: linking primate anatomy and human imaging. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *35*(1), 4-26.
- Hartley, C. A., & Somerville, L. H. (2015). The neuroscience of adolescent decision-making. *Curr Opin Behav Sci*, *5*, 108-115.
- Insel, C., Kastman, E. K., Glenn, C. R., & Somerville, L. H. (2017). Development of corticostriatal connectivity constrains goal-directed behavior during adolescence. *Nat Commun*, *8*(1), 1605.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk.

*Econometrica*, 47(2), 263-292.

Knutson, B., Katovich, K., & Suri, G. (2014). Inferring affect from fMRI data. *Trends Cogn Sci*, 18(8), 422-428.

Lang, P. J. (1980). *Self-assessment manikin*. Gainesville, FL: The Center for Research in Psychophysiology, University of Florida.

Liu, X., Hairston, J., Schrier, M., & Fan, J. (2011). Common and distinct networks underlying reward valence and processing stages: a meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*, 35(5), 1219-1236.

May, J. C., Delgado, M. R., Dahl, R. E., Stenger, V. A., Ryan, N. D., Fiez, J. A., & Carter, C. S. (2004). Event-related functional magnetic resonance imaging of reward-related brain circuitry in children and adolescents. *Biol Psychiatry*, 55(4), 359-366.

O'Doherty, J. P. (2004). Reward representations and reward-related learning in the human brain: insights from neuroimaging. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*, 14(6), 769-776.

Op de Macks, Z. A., Gunther Moor, B., Overgaauw, S., Guroglu, B., Dahl, R. E., & Crone, E. A. (2011). Testosterone levels correspond with increased ventral striatum activation in response to monetary rewards in adolescents. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*, 1(4), 506-516.

Palminteri, S., Justo, D., Jauffret, C., Pavlicek, B., Dauta, A., Delmaire, C., Czernecki, V., Karachi, C., Capelle, L., Durr, A., & Pessiglione, M. (2012). Critical roles for anterior insula and dorsal striatum in punishment-based avoidance learning. *Neuron*, 76(5), 998-1009.

Pattwell, S. S., Bath, K. G., Casey, B. J., Ninan, I., & Lee, F. S. (2011). Selective early-acquired fear memories undergo temporary suppression during adolescence. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 108(3), 1182-1187.

Pattwell, S. S., Duhoux, S., Hartley, C. A., Johnson, D. C., Jing, D., Elliott, M. D., Ruberry, E. J., Powers, A., Mehta, N., Yang, R. R., Soliman, F., Glatt, C. E., Casey, B. J., Ninan, I., & Lee, F. S. (2012). Altered fear learning across development in both mouse and human. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 109(40), 16318-16323.

- Pattwell, S. S., Liston, C., Jing, D., Ninan, I., Yang, R. R., Witztum, J., Murdock, M. H., Dincheva, I., Bath, K. G., Casey, B. J., Deisseroth, K., & Lee, F. S. (2016). Dynamic changes in neural circuitry during adolescence are associated with persistent attenuation of fear memories. *Nat Commun*, 7, 11475.
- Peirce, J. W. (2007). PsychoPy--Psychophysics software in Python. *J Neurosci Methods*, 162(1-2), 8-13.
- Pessiglione, M., & Delgado, M. R. (2015). The good, the bad and the brain: neural correlates of appetitive and aversive values underlying decision making. *Curr Opin Behav Sci*, 5, 78-84.
- Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., & R Core Team. (2014). nlme: linear and nonlinear mixed effects models. R package version 3.1-117. Available at <http://cran.r-project.org/package=nlme>.
- Powers, K. E., Yaffe, G., Hartley, C. A., Davidow, J. Y., Kober, H., & Somerville, L. H. (in press). Consequences for peers differentially bias computations about risk from adolescence to adulthood. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.
- Rangel, A., & Clithero, J. A. (2012). Value normalization in decision making: theory and evidence. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*, 22(6), 970-981.
- Rodman, A. M., Powers, K. E., & Somerville, L. H. (2017). Development of self-protective biases in response to social evaluative feedback. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 114(50), 13158-13163.
- Samanez-Larkin, G. R., Hollon, N. G., Carstensen, L. L., & Knutson, B. (2008). Individual differences in insular sensitivity during loss anticipation predict avoidance learning. *Psychol Sci*, 19(4), 320-323.
- Seymour, B., & McClure, S. M. (2008). Anchors, scales and the relative coding of value in the brain. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*, 18(2), 173-178.
- Sherman, L., Steinberg, L., & Chein, J. (2017). Connecting brain responsivity and real-world risk taking: Strengths and limitations of current methodological approaches. *Dev Cogn Neurosci*.
- Silverman, M. H., Jedd, K., & Luciana, M. (2015). Neural networks involved in adolescent reward processing: An activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies. *Neuroimage*, 122, 427-439.
- Smith, S. M., Jenkinson, M., Woolrich, M. W., Beckmann, C. F., Behrens, T. E., Johansen-Berg, H., Bannister, P. R., De Luca, M., Drobnjak, I., Flitney, D. E., Niazy, R. K., Saunders, J., Vickers, J.,

- Zhang, Y., De Stefano, N., Brady, J. M., & Matthews, P. M. (2004). Advances in functional and structural MR image analysis and implementation as FSL. *Neuroimage*, *23 Suppl 1*, S208-219.
- Smith, S. M., & Nichols, T. E. (2009). Threshold-free cluster enhancement: addressing problems of smoothing, threshold dependence and localisation in cluster inference. *Neuroimage*, *44*(1), 83-98.
- Somerville, L. H., & Casey, B. J. (2010). Developmental neurobiology of cognitive control and motivational systems. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*, *20*(2), 236-241.
- Somerville, L. H., Jones, R. M., & Casey, B. J. (2010). A time of change: behavioral and neural correlates of adolescent sensitivity to appetitive and aversive environmental cues. *Brain Cogn*, *72*(1), 124-133.
- Stevens, J. P. (1984). Outliers and influential data points in regression analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *95*(2), 334-344.
- Thesen, S., Heid, O., Mueller, E., & Schad, L. R. (2000). Prospective acquisition correction for head motion with image-based tracking for real-time fMRI. *Magn Reson Med*, *44*(3), 457-465.
- Tisdall, M. D., Hess, A. T., Reuter, M., Meintjes, E. M., Fischl, B., & van der Kouwe, A. J. (2012). Volumetric navigators for prospective motion correction and selective reacquisition in neuroanatomical MRI. *Magn Reson Med*, *68*(2), 389-399.
- van den Bos, W., Cohen, M. X., Kahnt, T., & Crone, E. A. (2012). Striatum-medial prefrontal cortex connectivity predicts developmental changes in reinforcement learning. *Cereb Cortex*, *22*(6), 1247-1255.
- van Duijvenvoorde, A. C., Huizenga, H. M., Somerville, L. H., Delgado, M. R., Powers, A., Weeda, W. D., Casey, B. J., Weber, E. U., & Figner, B. (2015). Neural correlates of expected risks and returns in risky choice across development. *J Neurosci*, *35*(4), 1549-1560.
- van Duijvenvoorde, A. C., Op de Macks, Z. A., Overgaauw, S., Gunther Moor, B., Dahl, R. E., & Crone, E. A. (2014). A cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis of reward-related brain activation: effects of age, pubertal stage, and reward sensitivity. *Brain Cogn*, *89*, 3-14.
- van Duijvenvoorde, A. C., Zanolie, K., Rombouts, S. A., Raijmakers, M. E., & Crone, E. A. (2008). Evaluating the negative or valuing the positive? Neural mechanisms supporting feedback-based learning across development. *J Neurosci*, *28*(38), 9495-9503.

van Leijenhorst, L., Crone, E. A., & Bunge, S. A. (2006). Neural correlates of developmental differences in risk estimation and feedback processing. *Neuropsychologia, 44*(11), 2158-2170.

Van Leijenhorst, L., Zanolie, K., Van Meel, C. S., Westenberg, P. M., Rombouts, S. A., & Crone, E. A. (2010). What motivates the adolescent? Brain regions mediating reward sensitivity across adolescence. *Cereb Cortex, 20*(1), 61-69.

Wechsler, D. (2011). *WASI II: Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (2nd ed.)*: Psychological Corporation.