



Increased Neural Response to Social Rejection in Major Depression

Journal:	<i>Depression and Anxiety</i>
Manuscript ID	DA-17-091.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Kumar, Poornima ; McLean Hospital, Center for Depression, Anxiety and Stress Research; Havard Medical School, Department of Psychiatry Waiter, Gordon; University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen Biomedical Imaging Centre Dubois, Magda; McLean Hospital, Center for Depression, Anxiety and Stress Research Milders, Maarten; Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Clinical Neuropsychology Reid, Ian; University of Aberdeen, The Institute of Medical Sciences Steele, J Douglas; University of Dundee, Medical Research Institute</p>
Keywords:	Depression, Brain imaging/Neuroimaging, Functional MRI, biological markers, mood disorders

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Increased Neural Response to Social Rejection in Major Depression**
4

5 Poornima Kumar^{a,b}, Gordon D Waiter^c, Magda Dubois^a, Maarten Milders^d, Ian Reid^e, J Douglas
6 Steele^f
7
8
9

10
11
12 ^aCenter for Depression, Anxiety and Stress Research, McLean Hospital, Belmont, MA, USA

13 ^bDepartment of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, MA, USA

14 ^cAberdeen Biomedical Imaging Centre, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK

15 ^dDepartment of Clinical Neuropsychology, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

16 ^eThe Institute of Medical Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK

17 ^fMedical School (Neuroscience), University of Dundee, Scotland, UK
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 ***Corresponding author:**

32 Dr Poornima Kumar

33 Center for Depression, Anxiety and Stress Research,

34 115 Mill Street, Mclean hospital

35 Belmont, MA 02478

36 Tel: +1 617-855-4244

37 Fax: +1 617-855-4231

38 Email: pkumar@mclean.harvard.edu
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Keywords: social exclusion, amygdala, insula, self-esteem, cyberball

52
53 * The work was carried out when Poornima Kumar was doing her PhD in the University of
54 Aberdeen
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background: Being a part of community is critical for survival and individuals with major depressive disorder (MDD) have a greater sensitivity to interpersonal stress that makes them vulnerable to future episodes. Social rejection is a critical risk factor for depression and it is said to increase interpersonal stress and thereby impairing social functioning. It is therefore critical to understand the neural correlates of social rejection in MDD.

Methods: To this end, we scanned 15 medicated MDD and 17 healthy individuals during a modified cyberball passing game, where participants were exposed to increasing levels of social exclusion. Neural responses to increasing social exclusion were investigated and compared between groups.

Results: We showed that compared to controls, MDD individuals exhibited greater amygdala, insula and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex activation to increasing social exclusion and this correlated negatively with hedonic tone and self-esteem scores across all participants.

Conclusions: These preliminary results support the hypothesis that depression is associated with hyperactive response to social rejection. These findings highlight the importance of studying social interactions in depression, as they often lead to social withdrawal and isolation.

INTRODUCTION

Anhedonia is a core feature of major depressive disorder (MDD) characterized by diminished interest and pleasure in previously enjoyed activities. From a social perspective, anhedonic individuals often derive little enjoyment from interpersonal interaction, report social disinterest and reduced motivation to belong to a social group, and in addition, often report that such experiences are both stressful and anxiety-provoking (Kupferberg, Bicks, & Hasler, 2016). Social engagement is vital for survival of many species. When people are socially excluded or have a greater sensitivity to rejection, four fundamental needs are proposed to be affected: belonging, self-esteem, control and meaningful existence which are required for human survival and effective social functioning (Williams, Cheung, & Choi, 2000). The impairment of social functioning is proposed to be reliable indicator of depression (Cheng & Furnham, 2003; Hirschfeld et al., 2000) and these dysfunctions in social interactions were reported to persist even after three years of recovery from depressive symptoms (Rhebergen et al., 2010) and correlated with unemployment, disability and decreased work performance (Rizvi et al., 2015). Further, depressed individuals possess specific traits that increase the likelihood they will experience interpersonal stress and have subsequent depressive episodes (Hammen, 2005). In light of this work, it is critical to study social interactions in MDD, as these interpersonal difficulties could be due to altered neural responding during social interactions, specifically heightened perception of and reaction to social rejection (Zimmer-Gembeck, Nesdale, Webb, Khatibi, & Downey, 2016).

Social rejection is one of the strongest proximal risk factors for depression (Slavich, O'Donovan, Epel, & Kemeny, 2010) and there are indications that rejection prospectively predicts depression (Nolan, Flynn, & Garber, 2003) and internal life stressors, that further increases future depressive episodes (Liu, Kraines, Massing-Schaffer, & Alloy, 2014). A recent study reported that almost 50% of patients with MDD experience increased rejection sensitivity (Ehnvall et al., 2014). A recent study showed that compared to healthy individuals, MDD patients had elevated negative feelings for an extended period (Hsu et al., 2015) and increased distress (Jobst et al., 2017) after a rejection trial.

In the recent years, several fMRI studies have examined the neural correlates of social rejection in healthy participants. The most commonly utilized task is the cyberball passing game in adults that evaluates social exclusion and peer rejection task in adolescents. These studies have reported that social rejection network encompasses dorsal anterior cingulate cortex, medial

1
2
3 prefrontal cortex (including subgenual cortex), insula, amygdala, ventrolateral prefrontal cortex
4 [VLPFC; (Cacioppo et al., 2013; Eisenberger, Lieberman, & Williams, 2003; Kawamoto, Ura,
5 Nittono, & Osipowicz, 2015; Premkumar, 2012; Sebastian et al., 2011; Silk et al., 2014).
6
7 Although no studies have investigated social rejection in MDD adults, studies in MDD and
8 anxious adolescents have reported increased amygdala and insula activation in response to social
9 rejection (Lau et al., 2012; Silk et al., 2014). Another region that has been critically implicated
10 during social rejection mainly in adolescents is the subgenual cingulate. Increased sgACC neural
11 activation has been reported to experiences of peer rejection and this was found to be correlated
12 with at-the-moment self-reported distress (Masten et al., 2009), and depressive symptoms during
13 the following year (Masten et al., 2011). To this end, we investigated neural responses to social
14 rejection (by measuring social exclusion) in MDD using fMRI and a modified version of the
15 'cyberball' paradigm. Consistent with the adolescent literature (Lau et al., 2012; Silk et al.,
16 2014), we hypothesized that MDD participants will have greater activation in the amygdala,
17 insula and subgenual cingulate to social exclusion than healthy controls.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 METHODS

30 *Participants*

31
32
33 The study was approved by the local ethics committee and all subjects provided written
34 informed consent. Fifteen MDD and 17 healthy individuals (HC) matched for age, gender and
35 verbal IQ (measured by National Adult Reading Test; Nelson and Willison, 1991) participated in
36 this study.
37
38
39

40 The patients were all outpatients referred by consultant psychiatrists from the Royal
41 Cornhill Hospital, Aberdeen, Scotland and diagnosed with a DSM IV diagnosis of (unipolar)
42 MDD without comorbidity (except generalized anxiety disorder). A detailed clinical assessment
43 consisting of a case note review, discussion with the patients' clinicians and a semi-structured
44 psychiatric interview was carried out on all patients by one of the authors (J.D.S.), an
45 experienced consultant psychiatrist. A Hamilton-21 depression rating (Hamilton, 1960) was
46 obtained as a measure of MDD illness severity a few days before scanning by J.D.S. All patients
47 had a duration of symptomatic illness >3 months despite continuous antidepressant treatment and
48 medications were stable for 1 month before scanning. Patient medications as total dose per day
49 were: escitalopram 15 mg, imipramine 200 mg, phenelzine 45-90 mg, trazodone 300 mg,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mirtazapine 30-60 mg, venlafaxine 150-225 mg, amitriptyline 200 mg, lithium carbonate 600-
4 800 mg (as antidepressant augmentation), citalopram 20 mg, fluoxetine 40 mg and sertraline 25-
5 150 mg. Healthy controls were recruited from the community.
6
7

8 Subject exclusion criteria were any current or history of DSM IV Axis I or II diagnosis
9 (except depression and anxiety in MDD group) including personality disorder, a history of
10 substance or alcohol misuse, structural brain abnormality, neurological disorder, use of non-
11 antidepressant medication which might alter brain metabolism (in HC) and ECT within the last
12 few months. Subjects with claustrophobia and fMRI contradictions were excluded. In addition,
13 all participants completed the Beck Depression Inventory [BDI (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock,
14 & Erbaugh, 1961)], Snaith-Hamilton pleasure scale (Snaith et al., 1995; a measure of hedonic
15 tone), Spielberger trait anxiety (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970) and Rosenberg Self
16 Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) on the morning of scanning. Demographics are listed in table 1.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ***Social interaction paradigm***

27 Participants were scanned while they played a ball passing game [adapted from
28 (Eisenberger et al., 2003) and successfully used in (Gradin et al., 2012)]. During the game,
29 participants believed that they would be playing with two other people (represented by animated
30 cartoons) present in adjacent rooms connected via the computer network. In reality, however, the
31 ball passing was programmed such that each participant received the identical number of
32 inclusion and exclusion trials. Subjects were instructed to press either of two buttons to pass the
33 ball to one of the cartoon figures. In turn, each cartoon figure either passed the ball to the subject
34 or passed it to the other cartoon figure. Throughout the task, the extent to which the subject was
35 excluded in the game (ball not being passed to the participant) was systematically varied from
36 0% (ball equally shared between all three players) to 100% (ball only passed between the two
37 cartoon figures) in steps of 25% after every block. Specifically, the task consisted of 17 blocks
38 with 12 trials each with the following percentage of exclusion: 0, 25, 50, 75, 100, 75, 50, 25, 0,
39 25, 50, 75, 100, 75, 50, 25, and 0. To increase the impression that the cartoons represented real
40 people making decisions, the time that the cartoon figures took to pass the ball was randomly
41 varied between 800 and 3000 milliseconds. Participants had a short practice session before
42 playing the task in the scanner. Participants were instructed to throw the ball to one of the other
43 people once they received it and were not told in advance about the different levels of exclusion
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that might occur throughout the game (Williams et al., 2000). The total task duration was ~10
4 minutes.
5
6
7

8 ***Social Ratings***

9
10 Following previous work, a structured set of questions on a scale of 0 (not at all) to 10
11 (very much) were asked immediately after scanning to assess the subjects' emotional response to
12 varying levels of inclusion during the game (Williams et al., 2000): (a) 'belongingness' was rated
13 by "How much do you feel belonged to the group?", (b) 'inclusiveness' by "Did you feel you
14 were ignored by the other participants?", (c) 'self-esteem' by "To what extent do you think the
15 other participants value you as a person?". Two sample t-tests were used to test for hypothesized
16 between-group differences.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 ***Image Acquisition & Processing***

25 A 1.5 Tesla GE scanner was used to acquire 244 gradient echo T2* weighted echo-planar
26 images (TR = 2.5s; TE = 30ms; field of view = 240mm; voxel dimensions 3.75 x 3.75 x 5
27 acquired as 35 axial slices). In addition, a T1 structural scan was acquired (TR = 20ms, TE =
28 6ms, flip angle 35°, 124 contiguous 1.6mm axial slices of 256×256 voxels with an in-plane
29 resolution of 0.938mm²).
30
31
32
33

34 Functional MRI data was processed using FEAT (fMRI Expert Analysis Tool) version
35 6.0, part of FSL 5.0.6 (FMRIB's Software Library, <http://fsl.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/>). Pre-processing
36 included: Motion Correction using FSL's Linear Image Registration Tool (Jenkinson, Bannister,
37 Brady, & Smith, 2002); spatial smoothing using a Gaussian kernel of FWHM 5.0mm; grand-
38 mean intensity normalization of the entire 4D dataset by a single multiplicative factor; high pass
39 temporal filtering (Gaussian-weighted least-squares straight line fitting, with sigma=60s) and
40 pre-whitening to remove temporal autocorrelation (Woolrich, Ripley, Brady, & Smith, 2001).
41 FSL's Linear Image Registration Tool [FLIRT; (Jenkinson et al., 2002)] was used to register
42 functional images to 2mm Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) standard space.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 A block design with separate regressors for each percentage of social exclusion was
51 constructed. Each event was modelled using a gamma function and constructed as a
52 haemodynamic response function convolved with the block onset times. Temporal derivatives
53 were included as covariates of no interest to increase statistical sensitivity. The six realignment
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

parameters were added as covariates of no interest to allow for residual movement artefacts not removed by the pre-processing. Linear contrasts were built to investigate the brain regions that activated as a degree of exclusion and beta weights from this contrast were taken to the group level to investigate within- and between-group differences. All analyses were performed at the group level using mixed-effects analyses. Z statistic images were thresholded using clusters determined by $Z=2.0$ and a family-wise corrected cluster significance of $p < 0.05$. Beta weights from linear exclusion contrast and individual exclusion blocks were extracted to conduct correlation analyses with anhedonia and self-esteem and explore the increasing effects of exclusion between groups using t-tests respectively.

RESULTS

Behavioral Results

As expected, patients (MDD) scored more highly than healthy volunteers (HC) on the BDI (HC: 3.35 ± 2.87 ; MDD: 22.93 ± 8.22 , $p < 0.001$) and low on the Snailth-Hamilton anhedonia scale (HC: 51.00 ± 4.05 ; MDD: 35 ± 6.76 , $p < 0.001$; indicating low hedonic tone in MDD group). The mean HAM-D score for patients was 23.2 ± 4.31 . No differences in button presses (HC: 37.41 ± 4.08 ; MDD: 39.40 ± 7.10) or mean reaction times (HC: 2.77 ± 0.45 ; MDD: 2.72 ± 0.63) were observed between patient and control groups.

Social Ratings

No significant group differences were present for self-ratings of ‘belongingness’, ‘inclusiveness’ and ‘self-esteem’ all ($p > 0.1$, Table 2). This indicates that both groups were engaged in the task and perceived the social interaction paradigm in the same manner.

Imaging Results – Whole brain analyses

Within-group Analyses: Replicating previous work (Sebastian et al., 2011), healthy controls showed a significant increase in the medial frontal cortex with increasing social exclusion ($p < 0.05$ FWE corrected, Fig 1 and voxel coordinates listed in Table 3). In contrast, MDD participants revealed no significant brain activations with increasing degree of social exclusion.

Between-group Analyses: Two sample t-tests showed that MDD patients exhibited increased neural responses in the two clusters: Cluster 1 - encompassing right amygdala; and right insula; Cluster 2 - and left VLPFC, to increasing social exclusion compared to controls ($p < 0.05$ FWE

corrected, Fig 2). To explore if this group difference is driven by specific percentage of exclusion condition, we extracted parameter estimates from ~~anatomically constrained~~ functional ROIs. To ~~this end~~ separately evaluate the amygdala and insula, this cluster was separated into anatomically constrained functional ROIs ~~were created~~ by multiplying the right amygdala/insular ~~and VLPFC~~ clusters that showed the between-group differences with the anatomical ROIs defined by the Harvard-Oxford Atlas. ~~Post-hoc A~~ analyses using SPSS revealed that this between-group difference ~~were~~ was mainly driven by an increased neural response in the amygdala during 75% and 100% exclusion blocks and only during 100% block in the insula and VLPFC, Fig 2).

Exploratory post-hoc Correlations

Hedonic tone (as measured by Snaith Hamilton Inventory) correlated negatively with neural responses to increasing social exclusion in the amygdala ($r = -0.47$, $p = 0.007$), insula ($r = -0.41$, $p = 0.019$) and VLPFC ($r = -0.38$, $p = 0.032$) across all participants < 0.05 ; Fig 3).

Similarly, self-esteem as measured by Rosenberg self-esteem scale, correlated negatively with neural responses to increasing social exclusion in the amygdala ($r = -0.41$, $p = 0.02$), insula ($r = -0.47$, $p = 0.006$) and VLPFC ($r = -0.42$, $p = 0.019$) across all participants < 0.05 ; Fig 3).

DISCUSSION

The goal of the study was to investigate neural correlates of social exclusion in healthy and MDD individuals. Replicating previous work, healthy controls exhibited increased mPFC activation to increasing social exclusion (Sebastian et al., 2011). Between-group analyses revealed significant differences in neural activation to social exclusion. Specifically, MDD patients showed an increase, whereas healthy controls showed a decrease in neural activation in the amygdala, insula and VLPFC to increasing social exclusion. These results were significant even after controlling for trait anxiety. Interestingly, this neural response to exclusion in the insula, amygdala, and VLPFC correlated negatively with hedonic tone and self-esteem scores across all participants.

The insula is implicated in both affective and social functioning and acts as an integration to both external and internally focused states. As part of the salience network (Seeley et al., 2007), it is involved in processing both negative and positive emotions, and negative affective

1
2
3 states such as disgust, aversive stimuli and social rejection. Supporting our findings, depressed
4 (Silk et al., 2014) and anxious youth (Lau et al., 2012) exhibited increased insular activity to
5 social rejection during a slightly varied cyberball task. Our findings of increased insula activation
6 with increasing social exclusion in MDD might suggest that these individuals experienced
7 rejection trials as more salient and aversive than healthy controls. Supporting this, a recent study
8 showed that during the cyberball game, individuals who showed greater activity in the insula
9 reported greater feelings of social distress in response to social exclusion (Masten et al., 2009).

15 We found that amygdala activation increased in MDD individuals, but decreased in
16 healthy controls, in response to increasing social exclusion. Previous studies have shown MDD
17 patients to exhibit hyperactivation in the amygdala to negative emotional and threatening stimuli
18 (Harmer & Cowen, 2013). Being socially ostracized leads to significant discomfort, and
19 individuals fear exclusion and rejection. It is possible that healthy controls in the study were able
20 to better regulate their fears than MDD individuals. Consistent with our findings, studies have
21 reported hyperactivation in the amygdala to peer rejection in depressed and anxious youths (Lau
22 et al., 2012; Silk et al., 2014). Amygdala response to social rejection in healthy (Hsu et al., 2013)
23 and depressed individuals (Hsu et al., 2015) is thought to be regulated by endogeneous opioids
24 and the μ -opioid receptor (MOR), which is involved in alleviating physical and emotional pain,
25 including the effects of social rejection (Kupferberg et al., 2016). MOR activation in the
26 amygdala to social rejection might act as a protective mechanism and reduce the impact of the
27 stressors, as a greater magnitude of MOR activation in the amygdala has been reported in
28 individuals with a higher predisposition to resiliency during social rejection (Hsu et al., 2013). In
29 contrast, MOR deactivated the amygdala of MDD individuals during social rejection and this
30 may contribute to BOLD hyperactivity in this region to social rejection as observed in this study
31 (Hsu et al., 2015). Further supporting this, a polymorphism in the MOR gene has been recently
32 found to influence neural and psychological responses to rejection, likely by affecting opioid
33 receptor expression and signalling efficiency (Slavich et al., 2010). Our results remained
34 significant after controlling for anxiety which suggests that increased amygdala activation to
35 increasing social exclusion could be a potential biomarker for depression, consistent with other
36 proposals for amygdala hyperactivity to negative stimuli being a potential biomarker for MDD
37 (Harmer & Cowen, 2013).

1
2
3 Previous studies in healthy participants have reported effects of exclusion in the VLPFC
4 and associated this with emotional regulation of distress (Eisenberger et al., 2003; Sebastian et
5 al., 2011). However, in our study, we observed an increase in the VLPFC activation with
6 increasing social exclusion only in MDD, suggesting a compensatory mechanism in patients
7 during social exclusion, as groups did not differ in subjective reports of distress caused by
8 exclusion during the task.
9

10
11
12
13
14 Contrary to prior studies in peer rejection, we did not find subgenual cingulate
15 (sgACC) to be involved during increasing levels of social exclusion. Subgenual cingulate has
16 been shown to be more active when socially rejected vs accepted in adolescents and this
17 correlated with self-reported distress (Masten et al., 2009) and predicted depressive symptoms
18 during the following year (Masten et al., 2011). This is consistent with patterns of increased
19 baseline sgACC activity observed in adults with depression (Keedwell et al., 2009). Our negative
20 finding could be due to the fact that our analyses were focused on probing regions that increased
21 in activation with increasing levels of social exclusion and it is possible that the underlying
22 baseline sgACC activity was overall higher in MDD irrespective of changing levels of exclusion.
23 However, this interpretation should be regarded with caution and further investigation is needed.
24 It is important to note that we did not find any significant brain region that increased with
25 increasing degree of exclusion in MDD patients. It is possible that this might be due to patients
26 experiencing both low and high levels of exclusion similarly. However, in the amygdala, insula
27 and VLPFC, MDD participants do show a linear increase to exclusion.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Interestingly, neural response to increasing social exclusion across participants correlated
39 with hedonic tone and self-esteem, suggesting that participants with higher anhedonia and lower
40 self-esteem were associated with increased responses to increasing social exclusion. Several
41 studies have reported that individual's trait self-esteem predicts their affective response to social
42 exclusion (Kashdan et al., 2014; Onoda et al., 2010; Somerville, Jones, & Casey, 2010).
43 According to sociometer theory, trait self-esteem is a reliable predictor on individuals' past
44 experiences of being rejected and their perception of future interactions (Leary, Terdal, Tambor,
45 & Downs, 1995; Onoda et al., 2010). Because people with low self-esteem perceive that others
46 tend to reject and exclude them, experiences of social rejection should produce greater activation
47 in regions including the amygdala and insula that are commonly associated with the distress of
48 social rejection (Leary et al., 1995).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Anhedonia is suggested to be an endophenotype of depression and it is often associated
4 with dysfunctional reward system in depression. However, in our study, anhedonia measure,
5 which includes measures on social anhedonia, predicted the neural response to social exclusion,
6 suggesting that anhedonia might explain positive and negative, social and non-social symptoms
7 of depression.
8
9

10
11
12 Our findings suggest that these abnormal neural responses to social exclusion could
13 potentially explain the heightened rejection commonly reported in MDD patients (Ehnvall et al.,
14 2014; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2016). One study recently reported that individuals with chronic
15 depression react to social exclusion during the cyberball game with pronounced negative
16 emotions and reduction in plasma oxytocin levels. One of the functions of oxytocin is to
17 strengthen social bonding (Cochran, Fallon, Hill, & Frazier, 2013), suggesting that a reduction of
18 oxytocin to social exclusion might be one of the contributing factors for the interpersonal
19 dysfunction and difficulty in coping with aversive social cues (Jobst et al., 2017) often reported
20 in depression. These findings suggest that therapeutic interventions using oxytocin targeting
21 social impairments in depression might be a potential future area of investigation (Cochran et al.,
22 2013).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Several limitations should be acknowledged. As the first, the sample size was small,
32 hence results need to be interpreted with caution and it is important to replicate findings using
33 larger samples. Second, Ppatients were receiving antidepressant medication at the time of the
34 study and results may be confounded by medication status. Third, when a correction for multiple
35 correlations were applied using method described in (Sankoh et al., 1997), the correlations with
36 anhedonia and self-esteem became weaker, but still within the trend level, again stressing the
37 limitation of sample size. However, it is important to note that the correlation coefficients which
38 represent the effect size were in the range of 0.36 – 0.48, implying a moderate effect size.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 To our knowledge, this is the first study exploring neural correlates to increasing social
46 exclusion in depressed individuals. Compared to healthy controls, MDD participants exhibited
47 increased insula, amygdala and VLPFC activation to increasing social exclusion, suggesting a
48 potential mechanism for rejection sensitivity in depression. This highlights the importance of
49 studying social interactions in depression, as negative effects of social exclusion often lead to
50 social withdrawal and isolation.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Figure Legend:**
8
9

10 **Figure 1: Whole brain Results:** Medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) that increased in activation to
11 increasing social exclusion in healthy controls [cluster size = 764; peak voxel (12, 64, -18), $z =$
12 3.35]. Clusters are significant at Family-wise Error (FWE) $p < 0.05$.
13
14
15
16

17 **Figure 2:** Brain regions significantly different between MDD and healthy controls at whole
18 brain Family-wise Error (FWE) $p < 0.05$ correction. **A.** Right Amygdala (24, -2, -14; $Z = 3.02$);
19 **B.** Right Insula (38, 2, -18; $Z = 3.33$); **C.** Left VLPFC (-58, 14, 18; $Z = 3.43$). * indicates $p <$
20 0.05, † indicates $p = < 0.01$. Error bars indicate standard error.
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Figure 3:** Correlation between neural response in the right amygdala (A & B), insula (C & D)
27 and VLPFC (E & F) during increasing social exclusion and clinical severity symptoms (Hedonic
28 Tone; Rosenberg Self-Esteem) across all subjects.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for
9 measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *4*, 561–571.
- 10
11
12 Cacioppo, S., Frum, C., Asp, E., Weiss, R. M., Lewis, J. W., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2013). A
13 quantitative meta-analysis of functional imaging studies of social rejection. *Scientific*
14 *Reports*, *3*, srep02027.
- 15
16
17 Cheng, H., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality, self-esteem, and demographic predictions of
18 happiness and depression. *Personality and Individual Differences*.
- 19
20
21 Cochran, D., Fallon, D., Hill, M., & Frazier, J. A. (2013). The role of oxytocin in psychiatric
22 disorders: A review of biological and therapeutic research findings. *Harvard Review of*
23 *Psychiatry*, *21*(5), 219–247. <http://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2014.77.1.86>. Rejection
- 24
25
26 Ehnvall, A., Mitchell, P. B., Hadzi-Pavlovic, D., Parker, G., Frankland, A., Loo, C., Breakspear,
27 M., Wright, A., Roberts, G., Lau, P., Perich, T. (2014). Rejection sensitivity and pain in
28 bipolar versus unipolar depression. *Bipolar Disorders*, *16*(2), 190–198.
- 29
30
31 Eisenberger, N. I., Lieberman, M. D., & Williams, K. D. (2003). Does Rejection Hurt? An fMRI
32 Study of Social Exclusion. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *302*(5643), 290–292.
- 33
34
35 Gradin, V. B., Waiter, G., Kumar, P., Stickle, C., Milders, M., Matthews, K., Reid, I., Hall, J.,
36 Steele, J. D. (2012). Abnormal neural responses to social exclusion in schizophrenia. *PLoS*
37 *One*, *7*(8), e42608.
- 38
39
40 Hammen, C. (2005). Stress and depression. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *1*, 293–319.
- 41
42 Harmer, C. J., & Cowen, P. J. (2013). “It”’s the way that you look at it’--a cognitive
43 neuropsychological account of SSRI action in depression. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
44 *Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, *368*, 20120407.
- 45
46
47 Hirschfeld, R. M. A., Montgomery, S. A., Keller, M. B., Kasper, S., Schatzberg, A. F., Möller,
48 H.-J., ... Bourgeois, M. (2000). Social Functioning in Depression: A Review. *J Clin*
49 *Psychiatry*, *61*(4), 268–275.
- 50
51
52 Hsu, D. T., Sanford, B. J., Meyers, K. K., Love, T. M., Hazlett, K. E., Walker, S. J., Mickey, B.
53 J., Koeppe, R. A., Langenecker, S. A., Zubieta, J. (2015). It still hurts : altered endogenous
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 opioid activity in the brain during social rejection and acceptance in major depressive
4 disorder. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 20(2), 193–200.
- 5
6
7 Hsu, D. T., Sanford, B. J., Meyers, K. K., Love, T. M., Hazlett, K. E., Wang, H., Ni, L., Walker,
8 S. J., Mickey, B. J., Korycinski, S. T., Koeppe, R. A., Crocker, J. K., Langenecker, S. A.,
9 Zubieta, J. (2013). Response of the μ -opioid system to social rejection and acceptance.
10 *Molecular Psychiatry*, 18(11), 1211–7.
- 11
12
13
14 Jenkinson, M., Bannister, P., Brady, M., & Smith, S. (2002). Improved optimization for the
15 robust and accurate linear registration and motion correction of brain images. *NeuroImage*,
16 17, 825–841.
- 17
18
19 Jobst, A., Sabass, L., Palagyi, A., Bauriedl-schmidt, C., Christine, M., Sarubin, N., Buchheim,
20 A., Renneberg, B., Falkai, P., Zill, P., Padberg, F. (2017). Effects of social exclusion on
21 emotions and oxytocin and cortisol levels in patients with chronic depression. *Journal of*
22 *Psychiatric Research*, 60(2015), 170–177.
- 23
24
25
26 Kashdan, T. B., Dwall, C. N., Masten, C. L., Jr, R. S. P., Powell, C., Combs, D., Schurtz, D. R.,
27 Farmer, A. S. (2014). Who Is Most Vulnerable to Social Rejection ? The Toxic
28 Combination of Low Self-Esteem and Lack of Negative Emotion Differentiation on Neural
29 Responses to Rejection. *PloS One*, 9(3), e90651.
- 30
31
32
33 Kawamoto, T., Ura, M., Nittono, H., & Osipowicz, K. (2015). Intrapersonal and interpersonal
34 processes of social exclusion, 9(March), 1–11.
- 35
36
37 Keedwell, P., Drapier, D., Surguladze, S., Giampietro, V., Brammer, M., & Phillips, M. (2009).
38 Neural markers of symptomatic improvement during antidepressant therapy in severe
39 depression: subgenual cingulate and visual cortical responses to sad, but not happy, facial
40 stimuli are correlated with changes in symptom score. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*,
41 23(7), 775–788.
- 42
43
44
45 Kupferberg, A., Bicks, L., & Hasler, G. (2016). Social functioning in major depressive disorder.
46 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 69, 313–332.
- 47
48
49 Lau, J. Y. F., Guyer, a. E., Tone, E. B., Jenness, J., Parrish, J. M., Pine, D. S., & Nelson, E. E.
50 (2012). Neural responses to peer rejection in anxious adolescents: Contributions from the
51 amygdala-hippocampal complex. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 36(1),
52 36–44.
- 53
54
55
56 Leary, M. R., Terdal, S. K., Tambor, E. S., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social*
4 *Psychology*, 68(3), 518–530.
- 5
6
7 Liu, R. T., Kraines, M. a, Massing-Schaffer, M., & Alloy, L. B. (2014). Rejection sensitivity and
8 depression: mediation by stress generation. *Psychiatry*, 77(1), 86–97.
- 9
10 Masten, C. L., Eisenberger, N. I., Borofsky, L. A., McNealy, K., Pfeifer, J. H., & Dapretto, M.
11 (2011). Subgenual anterior cingulate responses to peer rejection: a marker of adolescents'
12 risk for depression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23(1), 283–292.
- 13
14 Masten, C. L., Eisenberger, N. I., Borofsky, L. a, Pfeifer, J. H., McNealy, K., Mazziotta, J. C., &
15 Dapretto, M. (2009). Neural correlates of social exclusion during adolescence:
16 understanding the distress of peer rejection. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*,
17 4(2), 143–57.
- 18
19 Nelson, H. E., & Willison, J. (1991). *The National Adult Reading Test (NART)*. Windsor: NFER-
20 Nelson.
- 21
22 Nolan, S. a, Flynn, C., & Garber, J. (2003). Prospective relations between rejection and
23 depression in young adolescents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(4), 745–
24 755.
- 25
26 Onoda, K., Okamoto, Y., Nakashima, K., Nittono, H., Yoshimura, S., Yamawaki, S.,
27 Yamaguchi, S., Ura, M. (2010). Does low self-esteem enhance social pain? The relationship
28 between trait self-esteem and anterior cingulate cortex activation induced by ostracism.
29 *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 5(4), 385–391.
- 30
31 Premkumar, P. (2012). Are You Being Rejected or Excluded? Insights from Neuroimaging
32 Studies Using Different Rejection Paradigms. *Clinical Psychopharmacology and*
33 *Neuroscience*, 10(3), 144–154.
- 34
35 Rhebergen, D., Beekman, A. T. F., de Graaf, R., Nolen, W. A., Spijker, J., Hoogendijk, W. J., &
36 Penninx, B. W. J. H. (2010). Trajectories of recovery of social and physical functioning in
37 major depression, dysthymic disorder and double depression: A 3-year follow-up. *Journal*
38 *of Affective Disorders*, 124(1–2), 148–156.
- 39
40 Rizvi, S. J., Cyriac, A., Grima, E., Tan, M., Lin, P., Gallagher, L. A., McIntyre, R. S., Kennedy,
41 S. H. (2015). Depression and Employment Status in Primary and Tertiary Care Settings.
42 *Canadian Journal Psychiatry*, 60(1), 14–22.
- 43
44 Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*. New York.
- 45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sankoh, A. J., Huque, M.F., Dubey, S.D. (1997). Some comments on frequently used multiple
4 endpoint adjustment methods in clinical trials. *Statistics in Medicine*, 16, 2529-2542.
5
6
7
8 Sebastian, C. L., Tan, G. C. Y., Roiser, J. P., Viding, E., Dumontheil, I., & Blakemore, S.J.
9 (2011). Developmental influences on the neural bases of responses to social rejection:
10 implications of social neuroscience for education. *NeuroImage*, 57(3), 686–94.
11
12 Seeley, W. W., Menon, V., Schatzberg, A. F., Keller, J., Glover, G. H., Kenna, H., Reiss, A. L.,
13 Greicius, M. D. (2007). Dissociable intrinsic connectivity networks for salience processing
14 and executive control. *J Neurosci*, 27(9), 2349–2356.
15
16 Silk, J. S., Siegle, G. J., Lee, K. H., Nelson, E. E., Stroud, L. R., & Dahl, R. E. (2014). Increased
17 neural response to peer rejection associated with adolescent depression and pubertal
18 development. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 9(11), 1798–1807.
19
20 Slavich, G. M., O'Donovan, A., Epel, E. S., & Kemeny, M. E. (2010). Black sheep get the blues:
21 A psychobiological model of social rejection and depression. *Neuroscience and*
22 *Biobehavioral Reviews*, 35(1), 39–45.
23
24 Snaith, R., Hamilton, M., Morley, S., Humayan, A., Hargreaves, D., & Trigwell, P. (1995). A
25 scale for the assessment of hedonic tone. The Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale. *British*
26 *Journal of Psychiatry*, 167, 99–103.
27
28 Somerville, L. H., Jones, R. M., & Casey, B. J. (2010). A time of change: behavioral and neural
29 correlates of adolescent sensitivity to appetitive and aversive environmental cues. *Brain and*
30 *Cognition*, 72(1), 124–33.
31
32 Spielberg, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, R. E. (1970). *Test Manual for the State-Trait*
33 *Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
34
35 Williams, K. D., Cheung, C. K., & Choi, W. (2000). Cyberostracism: effects of being ignored
36 over the Internet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 748–762.
37
38 Woolrich, M. W., Ripley, B. D., Brady, M., & Smith, S. M. (2001). Temporal autocorrelation in
39 univariate linear modeling of fMRI data. *NeuroImage*, 14(6), 1370–86.
40
41 Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Nesdale, D., Webb, H. J., Khatibi, M., & Downey, G. (2016). A
42 Longitudinal Rejection Sensitivity Model of Depression and Aggression: Unique Roles of
43 Anxiety, Anger, Blame, Withdrawal and Retribution. *Journal of Abnormal Child*
44 *Psychology*, 44(7), 1291–1307.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Increased Neural Response to Social Rejection in Major Depression

Poornima Kumar^{a,b}, Gordon D Waiter^c, Magda Dubois^a, Maarten Milders^d, Ian Reid^e, J Douglas
Steele^f

^aCenter for Depression, Anxiety and Stress Research, McLean Hospital, Belmont, MA, USA

^bDepartment of Psychiatry, Harvard Medical School, MA, USA

^cAberdeen Biomedical Imaging Centre, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK

^dDepartment of Clinical Neuropsychology, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

^eThe Institute of Medical Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK

^fMedical School (Neuroscience), University of Dundee, Scotland, UK

*Corresponding author:

Dr Poornima Kumar

Center for Depression, Anxiety and Stress Research,

115 Mill Street, Mclean hospital

Belmont, MA 02478

Tel: +1 617-855-4244

Fax: +1 617-855-4231

Email: pkumar@mclean.harvard.edu

Keywords: social exclusion, amygdala, insula, self-esteem, cyberball

* The work was carried out when Poornima Kumar was doing her PhD in the University of Aberdeen

ABSTRACT

Background: Being a part of community is critical for survival and individuals with major depressive disorder (MDD) have a greater sensitivity to interpersonal stress that makes them vulnerable to future episodes. Social rejection is a critical risk factor for depression and it is said to increase interpersonal stress and thereby impairing social functioning. It is therefore critical to understand the neural correlates of social rejection in MDD.

Methods: To this end, we scanned 15 medicated MDD and 17 healthy individuals during a modified cyberball passing game, where participants were exposed to increasing levels of social exclusion. Neural responses to increasing social exclusion were investigated and compared between groups.

Results: We showed that compared to controls, MDD individuals exhibited greater amygdala, insula and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex activation to increasing social exclusion and this correlated negatively with hedonic tone and self-esteem scores across all participants.

Conclusions: These preliminary results support the hypothesis that depression is associated with hyperactive response to social rejection. These findings highlight the importance of studying social interactions in depression, as they often lead to social withdrawal and isolation.

INTRODUCTION

Anhedonia is a core feature of major depressive disorder (MDD) characterized by diminished interest and pleasure in previously enjoyed activities. From a social perspective, anhedonic individuals often derive little enjoyment from interpersonal interaction, report social disinterest and reduced motivation to belong to a social group, and in addition, often report that such experiences are both stressful and anxiety-provoking (Kupferberg, Bicks, & Hasler, 2016). Social engagement is vital for survival of many species. When people are socially excluded or have a greater sensitivity to rejection, four fundamental needs are proposed to be affected: belonging, self-esteem, control and meaningful existence which are required for human survival and effective social functioning (Williams, Cheung, & Choi, 2000). The impairment of social functioning is proposed to be reliable indicator of depression (Cheng & Furnham, 2003; Hirschfeld et al., 2000) and these dysfunctions in social interactions were reported to persist even after three years of recovery from depressive symptoms (Rhebergen et al., 2010) and correlated with unemployment, disability and decreased work performance (Rizvi et al., 2015). Further, depressed individuals possess specific traits that increase the likelihood they will experience interpersonal stress and have subsequent depressive episodes (Hammen, 2005). In light of this work, it is critical to study social interactions in MDD, as these interpersonal difficulties could be due to altered neural responding during social interactions, specifically heightened perception of and reaction to social rejection (Zimmer-Gembeck, Nesdale, Webb, Khatibi, & Downey, 2016).

Social rejection is one of the strongest proximal risk factors for depression (Slavich, O'Donovan, Epel, & Kemeny, 2010) and there are indications that rejection prospectively predicts depression (Nolan, Flynn, & Garber, 2003) and internal life stressors, that further increases future depressive episodes (Liu, Kraines, Massing-Schaffer, & Alloy, 2014). A recent study reported that almost 50% of patients with MDD experience increased rejection sensitivity (Ehnvall et al., 2014). A recent study showed that compared to healthy individuals, MDD patients had elevated negative feelings for an extended period (Hsu et al., 2015) and increased distress (Jobst et al., 2017) after a rejection trial.

In the recent years, several fMRI studies have examined the neural correlates of social rejection in healthy participants. The most commonly utilized task is the cyberball passing game in adults that evaluates social exclusion and peer rejection task in adolescents. These studies have reported that social rejection network encompasses dorsal anterior cingulate cortex, medial

1
2
3 prefrontal cortex (including subgenual cortex), insula, amygdala, ventrolateral prefrontal cortex
4 [VLPFC; (Cacioppo et al., 2013; Eisenberger, Lieberman, & Williams, 2003; Kawamoto, Ura,
5 Nittono, & Osipowicz, 2015; Premkumar, 2012; Sebastian et al., 2011; Silk et al., 2014).
6
7 Although no studies have investigated social rejection in MDD adults, studies in MDD and
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

prefrontal cortex (including subgenual cortex), insula, amygdala, ventrolateral prefrontal cortex [VLPFC; (Cacioppo et al., 2013; Eisenberger, Lieberman, & Williams, 2003; Kawamoto, Ura, Nittono, & Osipowicz, 2015; Premkumar, 2012; Sebastian et al., 2011; Silk et al., 2014). Although no studies have investigated social rejection in MDD adults, studies in MDD and anxious adolescents have reported increased amygdala and insula activation in response to social rejection (Lau et al., 2012; Silk et al., 2014). Another region that has been critically implicated during social rejection mainly in adolescents is the subgenual cingulate. Increased sgACC neural activation has been reported to experiences of peer rejection and this was found to be correlated with at-the-moment self-reported distress (Masten et al., 2009), and depressive symptoms during the following year (Masten et al., 2011). To this end, we investigated neural responses to social rejection (by measuring social exclusion) in MDD using fMRI and a modified version of the ‘cyberball’ paradigm. Consistent with the adolescent literature (Lau et al., 2012; Silk et al., 2014), we hypothesized that MDD participants will have greater activation in the amygdala, insula and subgenual cingulate to social exclusion than healthy controls.

METHODS

Participants

The study was approved by the local ethics committee and all subjects provided written informed consent. Fifteen MDD and 17 healthy individuals (HC) matched for age, gender and verbal IQ (measured by National Adult Reading Test; Nelson and Willison, 1991) participated in this study.

The patients were all outpatients referred by consultant psychiatrists from the Royal Cornhill Hospital, Aberdeen, Scotland and diagnosed with a DSM IV diagnosis of (unipolar) MDD without comorbidity (except generalized anxiety disorder). A detailed clinical assessment consisting of a case note review, discussion with the patients’ clinicians and a semi-structured psychiatric interview was carried out on all patients by one of the authors (J.D.S.), an experienced consultant psychiatrist. A Hamilton-21 depression rating (Hamilton, 1960) was obtained as a measure of MDD illness severity a few days before scanning by J.D.S. All patients had a duration of symptomatic illness >3 months despite continuous antidepressant treatment and medications were stable for 1 month before scanning. Patient medications as total dose per day were: escitalopram 15 mg, imipramine 200 mg, phenelzine 45-90 mg, trazodone 300 mg,

1
2
3 mirtazapine 30-60 mg, venlafaxine 150-225 mg, amitriptyline 200 mg, lithium carbonate 600-
4 800 mg (as antidepressant augmentation), citalopram 20 mg, fluoxetine 40 mg and sertraline 25-
5 150 mg. Healthy controls were recruited from the community.
6
7

8 Subject exclusion criteria were any current or history of DSM IV Axis I or II diagnosis
9 (except depression and anxiety in MDD group) including personality disorder, a history of
10 substance or alcohol misuse, structural brain abnormality, neurological disorder, use of non-
11 antidepressant medication which might alter brain metabolism (in HC) and ECT within the last
12 few months. Subjects with claustrophobia and fMRI contradictions were excluded. In addition,
13 all participants completed the Beck Depression Inventory [BDI (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock,
14 & Erbaugh, 1961)], Snaith-Hamilton pleasure scale (Snaith et al., 1995; a measure of hedonic
15 tone), Spielberger trait anxiety (Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Lushene, 1970) and Rosenberg Self
16 Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) on the morning of scanning. Demographics are listed in table 1.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ***Social interaction paradigm***

27 Participants were scanned while they played a ball passing game [adapted from
28 (Eisenberger et al., 2003) and successfully used in (Gradin et al., 2012)]. During the game,
29 participants believed that they would be playing with two other people (represented by animated
30 cartoons) present in adjacent rooms connected via the computer network. In reality, however, the
31 ball passing was programmed such that each participant received the identical number of
32 inclusion and exclusion trials. Subjects were instructed to press either of two buttons to pass the
33 ball to one of the cartoon figures. In turn, each cartoon figure either passed the ball to the subject
34 or passed it to the other cartoon figure. Throughout the task, the extent to which the subject was
35 excluded in the game (ball not being passed to the participant) was systematically varied from
36 0% (ball equally shared between all three players) to 100% (ball only passed between the two
37 cartoon figures) in steps of 25% after every block. Specifically, the task consisted of 17 blocks
38 with 12 trials each with the following percentage of exclusion: 0, 25, 50, 75, 100, 75, 50, 25, 0,
39 25, 50, 75, 100, 75, 50, 25, and 0. To increase the impression that the cartoons represented real
40 people making decisions, the time that the cartoon figures took to pass the ball was randomly
41 varied between 800 and 3000 milliseconds. Participants had a short practice session before
42 playing the task in the scanner. Participants were instructed to throw the ball to one of the other
43 people once they received it and were not told in advance about the different levels of exclusion
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that might occur throughout the game (Williams et al., 2000). The total task duration was ~10
4 minutes.
5
6
7

8 ***Social Ratings***

9
10 Following previous work, a structured set of questions on a scale of 0 (not at all) to 10
11 (very much) were asked immediately after scanning to assess the subjects' emotional response to
12 varying levels of inclusion during the game (Williams et al., 2000): (a) 'belongingness' was rated
13 by "How much do you feel belonged to the group?", (b) 'inclusiveness' by "Did you feel you
14 were ignored by the other participants?", (c) 'self-esteem' by "To what extent do you think the
15 other participants value you as a person?". Two sample t-tests were used to test for hypothesized
16 between-group differences.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 ***Image Acquisition & Processing***

25 A 1.5 Tesla GE scanner was used to acquire 244 gradient echo T2* weighted echo-planar
26 images (TR = 2.5s; TE = 30ms; field of view = 240mm; voxel dimensions 3.75 x 3.75 x 5
27 acquired as 35 axial slices). In addition, a T1 structural scan was acquired (TR = 20ms, TE =
28 6ms, flip angle 35°, 124 contiguous 1.6mm axial slices of 256×256 voxels with an in-plane
29 resolution of 0.938mm²).
30
31
32
33

34 Functional MRI data was processed using FEAT (fMRI Expert Analysis Tool) version
35 6.0, part of FSL 5.0.6 (FMRIB's Software Library, <http://fsl.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl/>). Pre-processing
36 included: Motion Correction using FSL's Linear Image Registration Tool (Jenkinson, Bannister,
37 Brady, & Smith, 2002); spatial smoothing using a Gaussian kernel of FWHM 5.0mm; grand-
38 mean intensity normalization of the entire 4D dataset by a single multiplicative factor; high pass
39 temporal filtering (Gaussian-weighted least-squares straight line fitting, with sigma=60s) and
40 pre-whitening to remove temporal autocorrelation (Woolrich, Ripley, Brady, & Smith, 2001).
41 FSL's Linear Image Registration Tool [FLIRT; (Jenkinson et al., 2002)] was used to register
42 functional images to 2mm Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) standard space.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 A block design with separate regressors for each percentage of social exclusion was
51 constructed. Each event was modelled using a gamma function and constructed as a
52 haemodynamic response function convolved with the block onset times. Temporal derivatives
53 were included as covariates of no interest to increase statistical sensitivity. The six realignment
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

parameters were added as covariates of no interest to allow for residual movement artefacts not removed by the pre-processing. Linear contrasts were built to investigate the brain regions that activated as a degree of exclusion and beta weights from this contrast were taken to the group level to investigate within- and between-group differences. All analyses were performed at the group level using mixed-effects analyses. Z statistic images were thresholded using clusters determined by $Z=2.0$ and a family-wise corrected cluster significance of $p < 0.05$. Beta weights from linear exclusion contrast and individual exclusion blocks were extracted to conduct correlation analyses with anhedonia and self-esteem and explore the increasing effects of exclusion between groups using t-tests respectively.

RESULTS

Behavioral Results

As expected, patients (MDD) scored more highly than healthy volunteers (HC) on the BDI (HC: 3.35 ± 2.87 ; MDD: 22.93 ± 8.22 , $p < 0.001$) and low on the Snailth-Hamilton anhedonia scale (HC: 51.00 ± 4.05 ; MDD: 35 ± 6.76 , $p < 0.001$; indicating low hedonic tone in MDD group). The mean HAM-D score for patients was 23.2 ± 4.31 . No differences in button presses (HC: 37.41 ± 4.08 ; MDD: 39.40 ± 7.10) or mean reaction times (HC: 2.77 ± 0.45 ; MDD: 2.72 ± 0.63) were observed between patient and control groups.

Social Ratings

No significant group differences were present for self-ratings of ‘belongingness’, ‘inclusiveness’ and ‘self-esteem’ all ($p > 0.1$, Table 2). This indicates that both groups were engaged in the task and perceived the social interaction paradigm in the same manner.

Imaging Results – Whole brain analyses

Within-group Analyses: Replicating previous work (Sebastian et al., 2011), healthy controls showed a significant increase in the medial frontal cortex with increasing social exclusion ($p < 0.05$ FWE corrected, Fig 1 and voxel coordinates listed in Table 3). In contrast, MDD participants revealed no significant brain activations with increasing degree of social exclusion.

Between-group Analyses: Two sample t-tests showed that MDD patients exhibited increased neural responses in two clusters: Cluster 1 - encompassing right amygdala and insula; Cluster 2 - left VLPFC, to increasing social exclusion compared to controls ($p < 0.05$ FWE corrected, Fig 2).

1
2
3 To explore if this group difference is driven by specific percentage of exclusion condition, we
4 extracted parameter estimates from these functional ROIs. To separately evaluate the amygdala
5 and insula, this cluster was separated into anatomically constrained functional ROIs by
6 multiplying the right amygdala/insular clusters that showed the between-group differences with
7 the anatomical ROIs defined by the Harvard-Oxford Atlas. Post-hoc analyses using SPSS
8 revealed that this between-group difference was mainly driven by an increased neural response
9 in the amygdala during 75% and 100% exclusion blocks and only during 100% block in the
10 insula and VLPFC, Fig 2).

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 **Exploratory post-hoc Correlations**

20 Hedonic tone (as measured by Snaith Hamilton Inventory) correlated negatively with
21 neural responses to increasing social exclusion in the amygdala ($r = -0.47$, $p = 0.007$), insula ($r =$
22 -0.41 , $p = 0.019$) and VLPFC ($r = -0.38$, $p = 0.032$) across all participants < 0.05 ; Fig 3).

23
24 Similarly, self-esteem as measured by Rosenberg self-esteem scale, correlated negatively
25 with neural responses to increasing social exclusion in the amygdala ($r = -0.41$, $p = 0.02$), insula
26 ($r = -0.47$, $p = 0.006$) and VLPFC ($r = -0.42$, $p = 0.019$) across all participants < 0.05 ; Fig 3).

31 32 33 **DISCUSSION**

34 The goal of the study was to investigate neural correlates of social exclusion in healthy
35 and MDD individuals. Replicating previous work, healthy controls exhibited increased mPFC
36 activation to increasing social exclusion (Sebastian et al., 2011). Between-group analyses
37 revealed significant differences in neural activation to social exclusion. Specifically, MDD
38 patients showed an increase, whereas healthy controls showed a decrease in neural activation in
39 the amygdala, insula and VLPFC to increasing social exclusion. These results were significant
40 even after controlling for trait anxiety. Interestingly, this neural response to exclusion in the
41 insula, amygdala, and VLPFC correlated negatively with hedonic tone and self-esteem scores
42 across all participants.

43 The insula is implicated in both affective and social functioning and acts as an integration
44 to both external and internally focused states. As part of the salience network (Seeley et al.,
45 2007), it is involved in processing both negative and positive emotions, and negative affective
46 states such as disgust, aversive stimuli and social rejection. Supporting our findings, depressed
47
48
49

1
2
3 (Silk et al., 2014) and anxious youth (Lau et al., 2012) exhibited increased insular activity to
4 social rejection during a slightly varied cyberball task. Our findings of increased insula activation
5 with increasing social exclusion in MDD might suggest that these individuals experienced
6 rejection trials as more salient and aversive than healthy controls. Supporting this, a recent study
7 showed that during the cyberball game, individuals who showed greater activity in the insula
8 reported greater feelings of social distress in response to social exclusion (Masten et al., 2009).
9

10
11
12
13
14 We found that amygdala activation increased in MDD individuals, but decreased in
15 healthy controls, in response to increasing social exclusion. Previous studies have shown MDD
16 patients to exhibit hyperactivation in the amygdala to negative emotional and threatening stimuli
17 (Harmer & Cowen, 2013). Being socially ostracized leads to significant discomfort, and
18 individuals fear exclusion and rejection. It is possible that healthy controls in the study were able
19 to better regulate their fears than MDD individuals. Consistent with our findings, studies have
20 reported hyperactivation in the amygdala to peer rejection in depressed and anxious youths (Lau
21 et al., 2012; Silk et al., 2014). Amygdala response to social rejection in healthy (Hsu et al., 2013)
22 and depressed individuals (Hsu et al., 2015) is thought to be regulated by endogenous opioids
23 and the μ -opioid receptor (MOR), which is involved in alleviating physical and emotional pain,
24 including the effects of social rejection (Kupferberg et al., 2016). MOR activation in the
25 amygdala to social rejection might act as a protective mechanism and reduce the impact of the
26 stressors, as a greater magnitude of MOR activation in the amygdala has been reported in
27 individuals with a higher predisposition to resiliency during social rejection (Hsu et al., 2013). In
28 contrast, MOR deactivated the amygdala of MDD individuals during social rejection and this
29 may contribute to BOLD hyperactivity in this region to social rejection as observed in this study
30 (Hsu et al., 2015). Further supporting this, a polymorphism in the MOR gene has been recently
31 found to influence neural and psychological responses to rejection, likely by affecting opioid
32 receptor expression and signalling efficiency (Slavich et al., 2010). Our results remained
33 significant after controlling for anxiety which suggests that increased amygdala activation to
34 increasing social exclusion could be a potential biomarker for depression, consistent with other
35 proposals for amygdala hyperactivity to negative stimuli being a potential biomarker for MDD
36 (Harmer & Cowen, 2013).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Previous studies in healthy participants have reported effects of exclusion in the VLPFC
55 and associated this with emotional regulation of distress (Eisenberger et al., 2003; Sebastian et
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 al., 2011). However, in our study, we observed an increase in the VLPFC activation with
4 increasing social exclusion only in MDD, suggesting a compensatory mechanism in patients
5 during social exclusion, as groups did not differ in subjective reports of distress caused by
6 exclusion during the task.
7
8
9

10 Contrary to prior studies in peer rejection, we did not find subgenual cingulate
11 (sgACC) to be involved during increasing levels of social exclusion. Subgenual cingulate has
12 been shown to be more active when socially rejected vs accepted in adolescents and this
13 correlated with self-reported distress (Masten et al., 2009) and predicted depressive symptoms
14 during the following year (Masten et al., 2011). This is consistent with patterns of increased
15 baseline sgACC activity observed in adults with depression (Keedwell et al., 2009). Our negative
16 finding could be due to the fact that our analyses were focused on probing regions that increased
17 in activation with increasing levels of social exclusion and it is possible that the underlying
18 baseline sgACC activity was overall higher in MDD irrespective of changing levels of exclusion.
19 However, this interpretation should be regarded with caution and further investigation is needed.
20 It is important to note that we did not find any significant brain region that increased with
21 increasing degree of exclusion in MDD patients. It is possible that this might be due to patients
22 experiencing both low and high levels of exclusion similarly. However, in the amygdala, insula
23 and VLPFC, MDD participants do show a linear increase to exclusion.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Interestingly, neural response to increasing social exclusion across participants correlated
35 with hedonic tone and self-esteem, suggesting that participants with higher anhedonia and lower
36 self-esteem were associated with increased responses to increasing social exclusion. Several
37 studies have reported that individual's trait self-esteem predicts their affective response to social
38 exclusion (Kashdan et al., 2014; Onoda et al., 2010; Somerville, Jones, & Casey, 2010).
39 According to sociometer theory, trait self-esteem is a reliable predictor on individuals' past
40 experiences of being rejected and their perception of future interactions (Leary, Terdal, Tambor,
41 & Downs, 1995; Onoda et al., 2010). Because people with low self-esteem perceive that others
42 tend to reject and exclude them, experiences of social rejection should produce greater activation
43 in regions including the amygdala and insula that are commonly associated with the distress of
44 social rejection (Leary et al., 1995).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Anhedonia is suggested to be an endophenotype of depression and it is often associated
54 with dysfunctional reward system in depression. However, in our study, anhedonia measure,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 which includes measures on social anhedonia, predicted the neural response to social exclusion,
4 suggesting that anhedonia might explain positive and negative, social and non-social symptoms
5 of depression.
6
7

8 Our findings suggest that these abnormal neural responses to social exclusion could
9 potentially explain the heightened rejection commonly reported in MDD patients (Ehnvall et al.,
10 2014; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2016). One study recently reported that individuals with chronic
11 depression react to social exclusion during the cyberball game with pronounced negative
12 emotions and reduction in plasma oxytocin levels. One of the functions of oxytocin is to
13 strengthen social bonding (Cochran, Fallon, Hill, & Frazier, 2013), suggesting that a reduction of
14 oxytocin to social exclusion might be one of the contributing factors for the interpersonal
15 dysfunction and difficulty in coping with aversive social cues (Jobst et al., 2017) often reported
16 in depression. These findings suggest that therapeutic interventions using oxytocin targeting
17 social impairments in depression might be a potential future area of investigation (Cochran et al.,
18 2013).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the sample size was small, hence
28 results need to be interpreted with caution and it is important to replicate findings using larger
29 samples. Second, patients were receiving antidepressant medication at the time of the study and
30 results may be confounded by medication status. Third, when a correction for multiple
31 correlations were applied using method described in (Sankoh et al., 1997), the correlations with
32 anhedonia and self-esteem became weaker, but still within the trend level, again stressing the
33 limitation of sample size. However, it is important to note that the correlation coefficients which
34 represent the effect size were in the range of 0.36 – 0.48, implying a moderate effect size.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 To our knowledge, this is the first study exploring neural correlates to increasing social
42 exclusion in depressed individuals. Compared to healthy controls, MDD participants exhibited
43 increased insula, amygdala and VLPFC activation to increasing social exclusion, suggesting a
44 potential mechanism for rejection sensitivity in depression. This highlights the importance of
45 studying social interactions in depression, as negative effects of social exclusion often lead to
46 social withdrawal and isolation.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure Legend:

Figure 1: Whole brain Results: Medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) that increased in activation to increasing social exclusion in healthy controls [cluster size = 764; peak voxel (12, 64, -18), $z = 3.35$]. Clusters are significant at Family-wise Error (FWE) $p < 0.05$.

Figure 2: Brain regions significantly different between MDD and healthy controls at whole brain Family-wise Error (FWE) $p < 0.05$ correction. **A.** Right Amygdala (24, -2, -14; $Z = 3.02$); **B.** Right Insula (38, 2, -18; $Z = 3.33$); **C.** Left VLPFC (-58, 14, 18; $Z = 3.43$). * indicates $p < 0.05$, ‡ indicates $p = < 0.01$. Error bars indicate standard error.

Figure 3: Correlation between neural response in the right amygdala (A & B), insula (C & D) and VLPFC (E & F) during increasing social exclusion and clinical severity symptoms (Hedonic Tone; Rosenberg Self-Esteem) across all subjects.

REFERENCES

- Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *4*, 561–571.
- Cacioppo, S., Frum, C., Asp, E., Weiss, R. M., Lewis, J. W., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2013). A quantitative meta-analysis of functional imaging studies of social rejection. *Scientific Reports*, *3*, srep02027.
- Cheng, H., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality, self-esteem, and demographic predictions of happiness and depression. *Personality and Individual Differences*.
- Cochran, D., Fallon, D., Hill, M., & Frazier, J. A. (2013). The role of oxytocin in psychiatric disorders: A review of biological and therapeutic research findings. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry*, *21*(5), 219–247. <http://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2014.77.1.86.Rejection>
- Ehnvall, A., Mitchell, P. B., Hadzi-Pavlovic, D., Parker, G., Frankland, A., Loo, C., Breakspear, M., Wright, A., Roberts, G., Lau, P., Perich, T. (2014). Rejection sensitivity and pain in bipolar versus unipolar depression. *Bipolar Disorders*, *16*(2), 190–198.
- Eisenberger, N. I., Lieberman, M. D., & Williams, K. D. (2003). Does Rejection Hurt? An fMRI Study of Social Exclusion. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *302*(5643), 290–292.
- Gradin, V. B., Waiter, G., Kumar, P., Stickle, C., Milders, M., Matthews, K., Reid, I., Hall, J., Steele, J. D. (2012). Abnormal neural responses to social exclusion in schizophrenia. *PLoS One*, *7*(8), e42608.
- Hammen, C. (2005). Stress and depression. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *1*, 293–319.
- Harmer, C. J., & Cowen, P. J. (2013). “It’s the way that you look at it”--a cognitive neuropsychological account of SSRI action in depression. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, *368*, 20120407.
- Hirschfeld, R. M. A., Montgomery, S. A., Keller, M. B., Kasper, S., Schatzberg, A. F., Möller, H.-J., ... Bourgeois, M. (2000). Social Functioning in Depression: A Review. *J Clin Psychiatry*, *61*(4), 268–275.
- Hsu, D. T., Sanford, B. J., Meyers, K. K., Love, T. M., Hazlett, K. E., Walker, S. J., Mickey, B. J., Koeppel, R. A., Langenecker, S. A., Zubieta, J. (2015). It still hurts : altered endogenous opioid activity in the brain during social rejection and acceptance in major depressive disorder. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *20*(2), 193–200.
- Hsu, D. T., Sanford, B. J., Meyers, K. K., Love, T. M., Hazlett, K. E., Wang, H., Ni, L., Walker,

- 1
2
3 S. J., Mickey, B. J., Korycinski, S. T., Koeppe, R. A., Crocker, J. K., Langenecker, S. A.,
4 Zubieta, J. (2013). Response of the μ -opioid system to social rejection and acceptance.
5 *Molecular Psychiatry*, *18*(11), 1211–7.
6
7
8 Jenkinson, M., Bannister, P., Brady, M., & Smith, S. (2002). Improved optimization for the
9 robust and accurate linear registration and motion correction of brain images. *NeuroImage*,
10 *17*, 825–841.
11
12
13 Jobst, A., Sabass, L., Palagyi, A., Bauriedl-schmidt, C., Christine, M., Sarubin, N., Buchheim,
14 A., Renneberg, B., Falkai, P., Zill, P., Padberg, F. (2017). Effects of social exclusion on
15 emotions and oxytocin and cortisol levels in patients with chronic depression. *Journal of*
16 *Psychiatric Research*, *60*(2015), 170–177.
17
18
19 Kashdan, T. B., Dwall, C. N., Masten, C. L., Jr, R. S. P., Powell, C., Combs, D., Schurtz, D. R.,
20 Farmer, A. S. (2014). Who Is Most Vulnerable to Social Rejection ? The Toxic
21 Combination of Low Self-Esteem and Lack of Negative Emotion Differentiation on Neural
22 Responses to Rejection. *PloS One*, *9*(3), e90651.
23
24
25 Kawamoto, T., Ura, M., Nittono, H., & Osipowicz, K. (2015). Intrapersonal and interpersonal
26 processes of social exclusion, *9*(March), 1–11.
27
28
29 Keedwell, P., Drapier, D., Surguladze, S., Giampietro, V., Brammer, M., & Phillips, M. (2009).
30 Neural markers of symptomatic improvement during antidepressant therapy in severe
31 depression: subgenual cingulate and visual cortical responses to sad, but not happy, facial
32 stimuli are correlated with changes in symptom score. *Journal of Psychopharmacology*,
33 *23*(7), 775–788.
34
35
36 Kupferberg, A., Bicks, L., & Hasler, G. (2016). Social functioning in major depressive disorder.
37 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *69*, 313–332.
38
39
40 Lau, J. Y. F., Guyer, a. E., Tone, E. B., Jenness, J., Parrish, J. M., Pine, D. S., & Nelson, E. E.
41 (2012). Neural responses to peer rejection in anxious adolescents: Contributions from the
42 amygdala-hippocampal complex. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *36*(1),
43 36–44.
44
45
46 Leary, M. R., Terdal, S. K., Tambor, E. S., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an
47 interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social*
48 *Psychology*, *68*(3), 518–530.
49
50
51 Liu, R. T., Kraines, M. a, Massing-Schaffer, M., & Alloy, L. B. (2014). Rejection sensitivity and
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- depression: mediation by stress generation. *Psychiatry*, 77(1), 86–97.
- Masten, C. L., Eisenberger, N. I., Borofsky, L. A., McNealy, K., Pfeifer, J. H., & Dapretto, M. (2011). Subgenual anterior cingulate responses to peer rejection: a marker of adolescents' risk for depression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 23(1), 283–292.
- Masten, C. L., Eisenberger, N. I., Borofsky, L. a, Pfeifer, J. H., McNealy, K., Mazziotta, J. C., & Dapretto, M. (2009). Neural correlates of social exclusion during adolescence: understanding the distress of peer rejection. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 4(2), 143–57.
- Nelson, H. E., & Willison, J. (1991). *The National Adult Reading Test (NART)*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.
- Nolan, S. a, Flynn, C., & Garber, J. (2003). Prospective relations between rejection and depression in young adolescents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(4), 745–755.
- Onoda, K., Okamoto, Y., Nakashima, K., Nittono, H., Yoshimura, S., Yamawaki, S., Yamaguchi, S., Ura, M. (2010). Does low self-esteem enhance social pain? The relationship between trait self-esteem and anterior cingulate cortex activation induced by ostracism. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 5(4), 385–391.
- Premkumar, P. (2012). Are You Being Rejected or Excluded ? Insights from Neuroimaging Studies Using Different Rejection Paradigms. *Clinical Psychopharmacology and Neuroscience*, 10(3), 144–154.
- Rhebergen, D., Beekman, A. T. F., de Graaf, R., Nolen, W. A., Spijker, J., Hoogendijk, W. J., & Penninx, B. W. J. H. (2010). Trajectories of recovery of social and physical functioning in major depression, dysthymic disorder and double depression: A 3-year follow-up. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 124(1–2), 148–156.
- Rizvi, S. J., Cyriac, A., Grima, E., Tan, M., Lin, P., Gallagher, L. A., McIntyre, R. S., Kennedy, S. H. (2015). Depression and Employment Status in Primary and Tertiary Care Settings. *Canadian Journal Psychiatry*, 60(1), 14–22.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*. New York.
- Sankoh, A. J., Huque, M.F., Dubey, S.D. (1997). Some comments on frequently used multiple endpoint adjustment methods in clinical trials. *Statistics in Medicine*. 16, 2529-2542.

- 1
2
3 Sebastian, C. L., Tan, G. C. Y., Roiser, J. P., Viding, E., Dumontheil, I., & Blakemore, S.J.
4
5 (2011). Developmental influences on the neural bases of responses to social rejection:
6
7 implications of social neuroscience for education. *NeuroImage*, 57(3), 686–94.
- 8
9 Seeley, W. W., Menon, V., Schatzberg, A. F., Keller, J., Glover, G. H., Kenna, H., Reiss, A. L.,
10
11 Greicius, M. D. (2007). Dissociable intrinsic connectivity networks for salience processing
12
13 and executive control. *J Neurosci*, 27(9), 2349–2356.
- 14
15 Silk, J. S., Siegle, G. J., Lee, K. H., Nelson, E. E., Stroud, L. R., & Dahl, R. E. (2014). Increased
16
17 neural response to peer rejection associated with adolescent depression and pubertal
18
19 development. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 9(11), 1798–1807.
- 20
21 Slavich, G. M., O'Donovan, A., Epel, E. S., & Kemeny, M. E. (2010). Black sheep get the blues:
22
23 A psychobiological model of social rejection and depression. *Neuroscience and
24
25 Biobehavioral Reviews*, 35(1), 39–45.
- 26
27 Snaith, R., Hamilton, M., Morley, S., Humayan, A., Hargreaves, D., & Trigwell, P. (1995). A
28
29 scale for the assessment of hedonic tone. The Snaith-Hamilton Pleasure Scale. *British
30
31 Journal of Psychiatry*, 167, 99–103.
- 32
33 Somerville, L. H., Jones, R. M., & Casey, B. J. (2010). A time of change: behavioral and neural
34
35 correlates of adolescent sensitivity to appetitive and aversive environmental cues. *Brain and
36
37 Cognition*, 72(1), 124–33.
- 38
39 Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Lushene, R. E. (1970). *Test Manual for the State-Trait
40
41 Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- 42
43 Williams, K. D., Cheung, C. K., & Choi, W. (2000). Cyberostracism: effects of being ignored
44
45 over the Internet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(5), 748–762.
- 46
47 Woolrich, M. W., Ripley, B. D., Brady, M., & Smith, S. M. (2001). Temporal autocorrelation in
48
49 univariate linear modeling of fMRI data. *NeuroImage*, 14(6), 1370–86.
- 50
51 Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Nesdale, D., Webb, H. J., Khatibi, M., & Downey, G. (2016). A
52
53 Longitudinal Rejection Sensitivity Model of Depression and Aggression: Unique Roles of
54
55 Anxiety, Anger, Blame, Withdrawal and Retribution. *Journal of Abnormal Child
56
57 Psychology*, 44(7), 1291–1307.
- 58
59
60

Table 1: Demographics, rating scale scores and task measures of controls and patients. Values are mean (standard deviation)

Variable	Controls	Patients	<i>p</i>
Sex	7M, 10F	6M, 9F	> 0.1
Age(years)	41.18 (11.58)	45.27 (12.32)	> 0.1
BDI	3.35 (2.87)	22.93 (8.22)	< 0.001
Anxiety	31.14 (10.77)	54.60 (11.53)	< 0.001
Hedonic Tone	51.29 (4.22)	35.0 (6.76)	< 0.001
Self-Esteem	23.13 (5.81)	11.33 (4.62)	< 0.001
HAM-D	n.a	23.2 (4.31)	n.a
Number of Responses	37.41 (4.08)	39.40 (7.09)	> 0.3
Reaction Time (s)	2.77 (0.45)	2.72 (0.63)	> 0.5

Abbreviations: M –Males; F - Females, n.a (not applicable), n.s (not significant); BDI – Beck Depression Inventory; Hedonic Tone measured by Snaith Hamilton Anhedonia Score (a low score indicating anhedonia); Self-Esteem measured by Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; HAM-D – Hamilton Depression Rating

Table 2: Linear analogue scale ratings. Standard deviations in parentheses.


	Patients	Controls
Belongingness		
How much do you feel you belonged to the group?	3.5 (2.8)	3.1 (1.6)
Not at all (0); very much (10)		
Self Esteem		
Do you think other participants valued you as a person?	6.4 (2.9)	5.1 (1.9)
Do value (0); do not value (10)		
Ignored and Excluded (measure of Inclusiveness)		
Did you feel you were ignored by the other participants?	6.9 (2.3)	5.9 (1.8)
0% ignored (0); 100% ignored (10).		

Table 3: Brain Regions significantly different between MDD and healthy controls at whole brain Family-wise Error (FWE) $p < 0.05$ correction.

Clusters	Cluster Size	Peak Coordinate	Z value
<i>Right Amygdala & Insula</i>	659		
Insula		38, 2, -18	3.33
Amygdala		24,-2,-14	3.02
<i>Left VLPFC</i>	659	-58, 14, 18	3.43

For Peer Review


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Whole brain Results: Medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC) that increased in activation to increasing social exclusion in healthy controls [cluster size = 764; peak voxel (12, 64, -18), z = 3.35]. Clusters are significantly at Family-wise Error (FWE) $p < 0.05$.

70x59mm (300 x 300 DPI)






Brain regions significantly different between MDD and healthy controls at whole brain Family-wise Error (FWE) $p < 0.05$ correction. A. Right Amygdala (24, -2, -14; $Z = 3.02$); B. Right Insula (38, 2, -18; $Z = 3.33$); C. Left VLPFC (-58, 14, 18; $Z = 3.43$). * indicates $p < 0.05$, † indicates $p < 0.01$. Error bars indicate standard error.

254x190mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Correlation between neural response in the right amygdala (A & B), insula (C & D) and VLPFC (E & F) during increasing social exclusion and clinical severity symptoms (Hedonic Tone; Rosenberg Self-Esteem) across all subjects.

279x317mm (300 x 300 DPI)