1	
2	DR ADRIENE M. BELTZ (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-5754-8083)
3	
4	
5	Article type : Research Article
6	
7	
	0
	S
8	
9	Neural heterogeneity underlying late adolescent motivational processing is linked to individual
10	differences in behavioral sensation seeking
11	
12	
13	Michael I. Demidenko ¹ , Edward D. Huntley ² , Alexander S. Weigard ³ , Daniel P. Keating ^{1,2} ,
_0 14	\mathbf{A} driene M. Beltz ¹
15	0
16	
17	Author's Note
18	¹ Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.
19	² Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.
20	³ Department of Psychiatry, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
21	
22	
	This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the <u>Version of Record</u>. Please cite this article as <u>doi:</u> 10.1002/JNR.25005

23 Corresponding Author Information: Correspondence concerning this article should be

- addressed to Michael Demidenko, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, 530
- 25 Church St. 2036, Ann Arbor, MI 48109. E-mail: <u>demidenm@umich.edu</u>
- 26

Abstract

27 Adolescent risk-taking, including sensation seeking (SS), is often attributed to developmental changes in connectivity among brain regions implicated in cognitive control and 28 29 reward processing. Despite considerable scientific and popular interest in this neurodevelopmental framework, there are few empirical investigations of adolescent functional 30 31 connectivity-let alone examinations of its links to SS behavior. The studies that have been done 32 focus on mean-based approaches and leave unanswered questions about individual differences 33 in neurodevelopment and behavior. The goal of this paper is to take a person-specific approach 34 to the study of adolescent functional connectivity during a continuous motivational state, and to 35 examine links between connectivity and self-reported SS behavior in 104 adolescents $(M_{Age}=19.3; SD_{Age}=1.3)$. Using group iterative multiple model estimation (GIMME), person-36 37 specific connectivity during two neuroimaging runs of a monetary incentive delay task was 38 estimated among 12 a priori brain regions of interest representing reward, cognitive, and 39 salience networks. Two data-driven subgroups were detected, a finding that was consistent 40 between both neuroimaging runs, but associations with SS were only found in the first run, 41 potentially reflecting neural habituation in the second run. Specifically, the subgroup that had 42 unique connections between reward-related regions had greater SS and showed a distinctive 43 relation between connectivity strength in the reward regions and SS. These findings provide 44 novel evidence for heterogeneity in adolescent brain-behavior relations by showing that subsets 45 of adolescents have unique associations between neural motivational processing and SS. 46 Findings have broader implications for future work on reward processing, as they demonstrate 47 that brain-behavior relations may attenuate across runs. 48 Keywords: Adolescence, fMRI, Monetary Incentive Delay Task, Functional Connectivity, Reward, Sensation Seeking, Motivation 49

50

51

Significance

52 Neuroscience research has provided critical insights into adolescent neurodevelopment. 53 Nevertheless, there is continued debate about their empirical support, potentially owing to their 54 focus on functional localization and average youth. Using a data-driven person-specific network 55 connectivity approach on two continuous runs of the monetary incentive delay (MID) task, we uncover two distinct subgroups for each run. During the first run, subgroups were significantly 56 related to self-reported sensation seeking, however, this effect was attenuated in the second run 57 and opposite in direction for the combined runs. Differences may relate to habituation or 58 59 reliability over time and power across methods.

60

61 1. Introduction

62 Adolescent risk-taking behavior, including sensation seeking, has been a central focus for 63 developmental research, interventions, and policy largely because it is a leading cause of death 64 and disease during an otherwise healthy period of life (Kann et al., 2018). Neuroscience 65 research has provided critical insights into the neurodevelopment during adolescence (Casey, 2015). For instance, there are varying degrees of support for a set of related models contending 66 67 that normative changes in the cognitive control system (e.g., dorsolateral prefrontal cortex) and 68 socioemotional system (e.g., ventral striatum and amygdala) during adolescence predispose youth to the sensation seeking characteristic of this developmental period. (Casey et al., 2008; 69 Ernst et al., 2006; Shulman et al., 2016; Steinberg, 2008). Although the implications of these 70 models have been far-reaching, there is continued debate about their empirical support and 71 72 applicability to all youth, potentially owing to their focus on functional localization and 73 quantitative methods that average across youth who may vary widely on relevant dimensions 74 (Beltz, 2018; Bjork & Pardini, 2015; Willoughby et al., 2013). The goal of this study is to begin to fill that knowledge gap by characterizing adolescent-specific functional networks of the 75 76 socioemotional and cognitive control systems during a motivational mental state presumed to 77 occur in a reward processing task and examining their associations with self-reported sensation 78 seeking behavior.

79 1.1 Neural Connectivity and Adolescent Reward Processing

80 Although there is considerable variability among them, most neurodevelopmental 81 models of adolescent risk-taking behavior (Casev et al., 2008; Ernst et al., 2006; Steinberg, 82 2008) broadly concern the interplay between brain regions implicated in: (a) cognitive control, 83 such as the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC) and dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC); and (b) 84 socioemotional processing, which can be broken down into the reward and salience subsystems. The reward subsystem facilitates approach behaviors, and includes the ventral striatum (VS), 85 86 orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), and ventromedial PFC (vmPFC) (Haber & Behrens, 2014; Haber & Knutson, 2010; Roy et al., 2012). The salience subsystem detects the valence of stimuli, and 87 includes the amygdala and insula (Knutson & Greer, 2008; Posner et al., 2005). Early studies 88 89 evaluted differences in mean-level activation of regions thought to contribute to sensation seeking behavior during reward processing that showed developmental differences between 90 91 adults and adolescents (reviewed in Silverman et al., 2015), such that adolescents had less 92 activation than adults in the ACC and VS when anticipating rewards (Bjork et al., 2010) but 93 greater activation than adults in the VS and insula when receiving rewards (Galván & 94 McGlennen, 2012). Some early studies also examined the associations between regional mean-95 level activations and risk-related behaviors, such that the likelihood of engaging in a risky 96 behavior in the future and VS activation were more strongly positively related in adolescents and adults (Galvan et al., 2007). 97

Although informative, these early studies generally did not consider functional 98 99 integration among the multiple regions that constitute each system or network (Pessoa, 2017). 100 Connectivity studies have the potential to map patterns among integrated neural networks 101 (Beltz, 2018; Lydon-Staley & Bassett, 2018). Specifically, connectivity overcomes limitations 102 of functional localization by evaluating the covariation, or functional dynamics, among regional 103 activations, which is emphasized in most theories of the neural underpinnings of adolescent 104 reward-seeking behavior (Beltz, 2018; Meisel et al., 2019). Furthermore, although prior studies 105 have used connectivity analyses, methods have often averaged across adolescents in an attempt 106 to describe normative development. In contrast, person-specific connectivity takes an individual 107 differences approach by modeling at the subgroup, or even at the individual, level. This is 108 important because there is growing evidence of extreme individual differences in both neural

109 function (Becht & Mills, 2020; Gordon et al., 2017; Finn et al., 2017; Poldrack, 2017) and in

adolescent brain development (Lydon-Staley & Bassett, 2018).

111 Sensation seeking is a psychological characteristic that is principal to 112 neurodevelopmental models (Shulman et al., 2016). In part, sensation seeking is presumed to be facilitated by reward-related, and dopamine-linked neural systems that impact an adolescent's 113 114 motivation to engage in risk-taking behaviors (Ernst & Spear, 2009). Sensation seeking has been reported to have a small-to-moderate associations with general health risk behaviors 115 (Demidenko et al., 2019), substance use disorders (Khurana et al., 2018) and simultaneous 116 alcohol and marijuana use in adolescents (Linden-Carmichael et al., 2019). To date, several 117 studies have considered the relation between mean (or group-level) connectivity and sensation-118 seeking. For instance, connectivity between the amygdala and the OFC during resting state 119 using seed-based functional connectivity (i.e., detecting associations between a candidate region 120 and all other brain regions) have been shown to be inversely related to sensation seeking (Crane 121 et al., 2018). Also, connectivity between VS and motor areas during incentivized trials in a task 122 using psychophysiological interaction (i.e., combining seed-based correlations and task 123 124 regressors) have been shown to be positively related to sensation seeking (Crane et al., 2018; Weiland et al., 2013). Finally, mean-level connectivity patterns in the OFC and ACC estimated 125 126 using Pearson's correlations from resting state data were reported to reliably predict (r = .30) 127 sensation seeking in adults (Wan et al., 2020). Together, these studies suggest that there may be 128 group-level links between patterns of neural connectivity and sensation seeking. Nonetheless, significant questions remain about the association between connectivity 129 130 and sensation seeking during adolescence, as participants in the studies reviewed above ranged

in age from 18 to 85 years (Crane et al., 2018) or only included young-to-mid adults aged 21 to 131 132 35 years (Wan et al., 2020). Questions about adolescent-specific motivational processes and 133 behavior are important to answer because the developmental peak in sensation seeking seems to be between ages 14 and 20 (Harden & Tucker-Drob, 2011; Romer, 2010). Although one study 134 examined functional connectivity patterns and sensation seeking in a late adolescent sample 135 (18-22 years old), the study looked only at mean-level connectivity in a sample of late 136 137 adolescents exposed to higher rates of adversity (Weiland et al., 2013). Thus, there is empirical evidence for meaningful associations between functional connectivity and sensation seeking at 138

the group level, but there remains a need for research on adolescents that captures individualdifferences.

141 1.2 Person Specific Connectivity

One promising way to accurately capture individual differences in the neural networks underlying adolescent motivational processing is to use a person-specific connectivity approach that avoids assumptions about uniformity (Beltz, 2018; Lydon-Staley & Bassett, 2018). Given the heterogeneity of functional networks (Finn et al., 2017) and adolescent behaviors (Bjork & Pardini, 2015), modeling person-specific covariation among regional activations may capture effects that are only present, or only particularly strong, in a subset of individuals or even that are unique to a single individual (see Beltz & Gates, 2017).

Group Iterative Multiple Model Estimation (GIMME; Gates & Molenaar, 2012) is one 149 such modeling approach. GIMME creates sparse person-specific networks specifying data-150 151 driven connections (or edges) among brain regions of interest (ROIs) that can occur at multiple 152 levels: group, subgroup and individual (Beltz & Gates, 2017; Gates et al., 2017). First, GIMME estimates group-level connections that are meaningful for at least 75% of individuals. Second, 153 154 subgroups are identified using the Walktrap community detection algorithm (Orman & Labatut, 2009), which clusters into a community individuals based on the similarity of their group-level 155 156 connection magnitudes (Gates et al., 2016), and then subgroup-level connections that are meaningful for only individuals in the same subgroup are estimated. Third, individual-level 157 connections that are unique to a person (and estimated after group- and subgroup-level 158 159 connections, which improves their reliability; Gates et al., 2017) are estimated. While the final 160 networks characterize both homogeneity (in the group-level connections – without averaging across individuals) and heterogeneity (in the individual-level connections) in a sparse network, 161 162 subgroup-level connections represent both homogeneity and heterogeneity. Simulation studies have demonstrated that GIMME effectively identifies the presence of connections between 163 164 ROIs and is to date an accurate method for modeling network patterns in functional time-series 165 data, especially compared to other approaches that assume homogeneity when participants are, 166 in fact, heterogeneous (Gates et al., 2017; Mumford & Ramsey, 2014; Smith et al., 2011). 167 GIMME has been successfully used to delineate person-specific networks in 168 developmental and clinical research (reviewed in Beltz & Gates, 2017; Beltz & Weigard, 2019). For instance, during an alcohol-related inhibition task in young adults, the number of 169

170 connections within the cognitive control system changed across the transition to college in 171 accord with alcohol use behaviors (Beltz et al. 2013). Moreover, during resting state, network 172 connectivity patterns in subgroups effectively delineated communities of children with different clinical diagnoses (e.g., autism spectrum disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder) 173 174 and healthy controls (Henry et al., 2019), such that children with diagnoses were characterized 175 by connections between the default mode, salience and ventral attention networks, whereas 176 controls were largely characterized by within-network connections. Likewise, resting state network connectivity patterns revealed subgroups of adolescents who varied in levels of 177 childhood violence exposure (Goetschius et al., 2020), which is particularly noteworthy because 178 179 it illustrates how GIMME can differentiate - in adolescence - brain networks of children with certain experiences of adversity in a purely data-driven fashion. The ability to capture both 180 181 homogeneity and heterogeneity in neural network features is critical in the study of adolescent sensation seeking and motivation processing, because risk-taking tendencies may represent only 182 a subset of youth and not all adolescents (Bjork & Pardini, 2015). 183

184 1.3 Current Study

185 In the current study, we examine whether person-specific network connectivity during a motivational processing task meaningfully relates to individual differences in self-reported 186 sensation seeking behaviors. Given our interest in modeling the dynamic complexity of the 187 brain and the precedent in prior studies using GIMME with task fMRI (Beltz et al., 2013; Duffy 188 et al., 2021; Hillary et al., 2014; Weigard et al., 2018), we do not consider modulating effects of 189 190 task regressors but rather focus on comprehensively evaluating connectivity during a 191 *motivational state*, or a state of being continuously engaged in a task in which possible gains and losses are evaluated and received. In other words, we uniquely capture relations among a 192 193 broad set of ROIs to understand systems-level neural integration during continuous motivational 194 processing, but we do not explicitly estimate contrasts (e.g., gain > loss) as in traditional 195 analyses of the Monetary Incentive Delay (MID) task; thus, our GIMME networks may not 196 reflect reward processing per se (Balodis & Potenza, 2015; Dugré et al., 2018). Specifically, we applied GIMME to two separate runs of the MID task (Knutson et al., 197

2000) in a sample of late adolescents, focusing on 12 ROIs that reflect the cognitive control,
reward and salience networks (e.g., bilateral OFC, DLPFC, Insula, Amygdala, VS, and ACC

and vmPFC). As described above and in the neurodevelopmental literature (Demidenko et al.,

201 2020; Sherman et al., 2018; Silverman et al., 2015; Steinberg, 2010), we focus on these ROIs 202 given evidence for the role of dIPFC and ACC in cognitive control processes (Apps et al., 2016; 203 Szczepanski & Knight, 2014); the role of VS, OFC and vmPFC in motivational processes and 204 economic decision-making (Haber & Behrens, 2014; Knutson et al., 2014; Padoa-Schioppa & Conen, 2017; Roy et al., 2012); and the role of the insula and amygdala in valence and affective 205 206 processing (Knutson et al., 2014; Posner et al., 2005). Although we use network labels, such as 207 cognitive control, reward and salience, as heuristics, brain regions are rarely localized to specific networks (Rolls, 2014) or affective processes (Berridge, 2019); instead, they play a 208 dynamic part in a complex interacting system (Pessoa, 2021). Thus, these network labels are 209 210 intended to serve as conceptual links to the neurodevelopmental models from which the hypotheses below are derived (Casey et al., 2008; Ernst, 2014; Steinberg, 2010). 211

We implement GIMME's subgroup community detection algorithm to uncover potential communities of adolescents who share neural features during motivational processing, and then we examine how these features relate to adolescent sensation seeking behavior. Given that reported poor within-participant reliability in task-based fMRI may be attributed to habituation (Elliott et al., 2020), or waning vigilance or novelty in reward systems triggered by fMRI tasks (Ekhtiari et al., 2020; Plichta et al., 2012), we also consider the network connectivity during the combined and individual MID run time-series.

219 Our study is comprised of three aims. In Aim 1, we map person-specific connectivity in 220 reward processing regions separately for each run of the MID task, exploring whether there are data-driven subgroups during a presume motivational state. In Aim 2, we examine whether 221 222 there are meaningful associations between network features (such as subgroup membership and 223 connection strength) and sensation seeking separately by run. In Aim 3, we compare estimated 224 connections between Run 01 and Run 02 to detect potential habituation across runs and repeat 225 Aims 1 and 2 for the combined runs to evaluate the robustness of findings from the individual runs for the combined time-series. We expect to find substantial individual differences in 226 227 motivational processing, evidenced by person-specific networks, but given the novelty of this 228 approach, we do not have expectations about whether data-driven subgroups will exist. 229 Nevertheless, we do hypothesize that connectivity strength between reward and cognitive control ROIs will be related to sensation seeking based on common neurodevelopmental models 230 231 that implicate regions, including the VS, OFC, vmPFC and/or dlPFC, in the relationship to

- sensation seeking (Casey et al., 2008; Casey et al., 2019; Ernst et al., 2006; Shulman et al.,
- 233 2016; Steinberg, 2008).

234 2. Methods

235 2.1 Participants

Participants in this study are a Phase II subsample (N = 104; $M_{Age} = 19.3$; $SD_{Age} = 1.3$; 57% Female; 71% White, 14% Black, non-Hispanic, 6% Hispanic/Latinx) of adolescents from the Adolescent Health Risk Behavior (AHRB) study described in supplementary Section 2.1. Of the 115 participants eligible for inclusion, 104 are included in this study. Seven participants were not safe to magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scan (n = 7), and four completed the scan but were excluded from analyses due to non-recoverable artifacts in the images (n = 3) or failing to respond during the MID task (n = 1).

During Phase I, participants completed behavioral questionnaires, including sensation 243 seeking, across three waves at 18-month intervals beginning in mid-to-late adolescence that 244 were administered using computer assisted self-interviewing (Wave 1, $M_{Age} = 16.8$ years, SD_{Age} 245 = 1.1). As described in supplementary Section 2.1, participants characterized as high or 246 average/low risk takers at Phase I on a latent Behavioral Misadventure Score that comprises 15-247 health risk behaviors were recruited to participate in the neuroimaging Phase II. The behavioral 248 249 data from Wave 1 to Wave 3 are used here in assessments of sensation seeking for each participant (described below). During Wave 1, participants completed surveys in school, 250 251 administered using computer assisted self-interviewing, and during Wave 2 and Wave 3, participants completed surveys on their own time using web-based computer assisted 252 253 interviewing.

254 2.2 Procedures

All study procedures were approved by the University of Michigan Institutional Review Board. Upon arrival for Phase II neuroimaging, research staff reviewed instructions of the MID task. Participants were informed of the cue-related outcomes and completed a practice trial. Participants were explicitly informed that their performance, or cumulative earnings during the MID (maximum of \$30), would be associated with the compensation they received at the end of the visit. 261 2.3 Measures

262 Sensation Seeking: Participants completed the Brief Sensation Seeking Scale (BSSS), which is an 8-item self-report measure of novelty-seeking behaviors (Hoyle et al., 2002). 263 264 Participants responded on a 5-point Likert-scale for 8 items: (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree." Example items are "I would like to explore strange places" or "I would like to 265 try bungee jumping". The BSSS is a revised version of the earlier SSS (Horvath & Zuckerman, 266 1993; Zuckerman et al., 1978) that updates behavioral descriptions and language, and that 267 268 removes similar items (e.g., related to alcohol) (Arnett, 1994; Hoyle et al., 2002). The 269 composite variable is the average of the 8 items, such that higher scores reflect higher sensation 270 seeking (Cronbach's $\alpha = .78$).

271 In order to utilize the longitudinal sensation seeking data from Phase I of this study, 272 growth curves were used to estimate behavior at Wave 3 (most proximal to the scan) for all 273 participants. Specifically, SAS 9.4 PROC NLMIXED (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) was used to fit mixed-effects growth curve models to the three waves of BSSS data treating the intercept 274 275 as a random effect and using an unstructured error covariance matrix; the intercept was calculated at Wave 3. Across the three waves, 100% ($N_{Wave l} = 104$; M = 3.29, SD = .76), 77% 276 $(N_{Wave 2} = 80; M = 3.26, SD = .72)$ and 89% $(N_{Wave 3} = 93; M = 3.33, SD = .56)$ of participants 277 278 provided BSSS data. Full information maximum likelihood estimation was used in combination 279 with empirical Bayes estimates to provide intercepts for all 104 participants in the sample (Rubin, 1976). As expected, the individual BSSS intercept estimates were highly correlated 280 281 with the observed Wave 3 self-reported BSSS, r = .82.

282 fMRI Task: The MID task (Knutson et al., 2000) was used to measure brain activity 283 during a motivational state that comprised both monetary gains and losses. The MID is a well-284 established task for assessing reward processing, and the version used here is administered in the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study (Casey et al., 2018). The task consists of 285 three phases: anticipation, probe and feedback. Each trial starts with a cue type (i.e., Win \$0.20, 286 Win \$5, Lose \$5, Lose \$0.20, or No Money At Stake) presented on the screen for 2000 ms 287 288 followed by a jittered fixation cross (1500–4000 ms). Next, the target probe cue (187–500 ms) 289 appears and requires participants to respond in order to win or not lose money, and it is 290 followed by the feedback phase (1450 - 1763 ms) during which participants are informed if 291 they receive the reward. Two MID runs were administered; each lasted 5:42 min and consistent

of 407 volumes (See Supplemental Figure S2 and Section 2.3 for more information about the design and the task schematic). The MID task is considered a *rapid* event-related design, as the inter-stimulus interval is *shorter* than the hemodynamic response function (Soares et al., 2016).

295 2.4 fMRI Acquisition

296 Data were acquired using a GE Discovery MR750 3.0 Tesla scanner with a standard 297 adult-sized coil (Milwaukee, WI). A full-brain high-resolution T1 SPGR PROMO scan was acquired for registration (TR = 7000ms, TE = 2900ms, flip angle = 8° , FOV = 25.6 cm, slice 298 thickness = 1 mm, 208 sagittal slices; matrix = 256 x 256). Next, two functional T2*-weighted 299 BOLD MID runs were acquired in the axial plane using a multiband EPI sequence (MB 300 301 factor=6) of 60 contiguous axial 2.4 mm slices (TR = 800ms, TE = 30 ms, flip angle = 52° , FOV = 21.6 cm, 90x90 matrix, volumes = 407). A fieldmap was also acquired right before the 302 task using spin-echo EPI (TR = 7400ms, TE = 80 ms, FOV = 21.6 cm, $90 \times 90 \text{ matrix}$) with 303 opposite phase encoding polarity ($A \rightarrow P, P \rightarrow A$). 304

305 2.5 fMRI Preprocessing & Time-series Extractions

FMRI data: (1) were reconstructed; (2) had realignment and field map correction applied
in SPM12; and (3) had physiological noise removed using RETROICOR (Glover et al., 2000).
Preprocessing was then completed using FSL (FMRIB's Software Library,
<u>www.fmrib.ox.ac.uk/fsl</u>) FEAT (FMRI Expert Analysis Tool) Version 6.00. This included: (4)
registration to high resolution structural and standard space MNI 152 image using FLIRT using
a Full search 12 DOF (Jenkinson & Smith, 2001; Jenkinson, Bannister, Brady, & Smith, 2002);

- 312 (5) motion correction using MCFLIRT (Jenkinson et al., 2002); (6) non-brain removal using
- BET (Smith, 2002); (7) spatial smoothing using a Gaussian kernel of FWHM 5mm; (8) grand-
- mean intensity normalisation of the entire 4D dataset by a single multiplicative factor; and (9)
- 315 highpass temporal filtering (Gaussian-weighted least-squares straight line fitting, with

316 sigma=50.0s)	•
------------------	---

317 2.6 Region of Interest Identification and Time-series Extraction

318 Several steps were completed to extract the time-series data for GIMME analyses. First, central coordinates for 12 ROIs (see Figure 1; Supplementary Section 2.6 Table S1 for specific 319 MNI coordinates) were selected using Neurosynth (Neurosynth.org) based on previous 320 321 literature (Galvan, 2010; Sherman et al., 2018). These regions belong to three networks: the cognitive control network, which consists of the bilateral DLPFC, and ACC; the reward 322 network, which consists of the bilateral VS, vmPFC and OFC; and the salience network, which 323 consists of the bilateral amygdala and insula. As mentioned previously, these network labels are 324 325 heuristics linked to neurodevelopmental models. 326 For each ROI, a 10mm sphere around the central coordinate was used to extract the 327 mean signal intensities at each volume for each of the two runs. For Aims 1-2, the entire timeseries from each separate run was used, however, for Aim 3, the concatenated time-series across 328

329 the two runs was used. Due to the rapid volume acquisition (800ms), each run was downsampled (retaining every other volume) after preprocessing, as has been suggested (Beltz & 330

331 Gates, 2017) and used in other fast-acquisition methods, such as functional near-infrared

spectroscopy (Pinti et al., 2019). 332



Figure 2. GIMME Model Flow Chart.

Lines represent: Group connections = Black; Subgroup connections = Green; Individual connections = Grey; Solid = Contemporaneous; Dashed = Lagged; Green = Subgroup 1; Red = Subgroup 2

334 2.7 GIMME Analyses

335 GIMME version 0.6-0 in R version 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2020) was used to estimate time-lagged (t-1) and contemporaneous (t) network connections in unified structural equation 336 337 models (uSEM), which combine vector autoregressions and structural equation models, 338 respectively, for each individual within a grouping algorithm that contains subgrouping via community detection. GIMME estimates network connections through a data-driven search 339 340 process that uses Lagrange multiplier tests to select connections at the group, subgroup and 341 individual level that most improve model fit. The sequential steps of the GIMME search process 342 are summarized in Figure 2. At the beginning of these steps, we estimate autoregressive connections as part of a "null" model, as this search strategy has been demonstrated to improve 343 344 recovery of other connections in temporally dense data (Lane et al., 2019). Then, starting with this null model, group-level connections that best improve fit for the at least 75% of the sample 345 346 are iteratively estimated for all participants. After the estimation of the group-level connections, 347 GIMME uses this *a priori* model to inform subgroup detection. Subgroups are estimated using a data-driven community detection technique to cluster individuals with common sets of 348 interconnected ROIs via Walktrap. For each subgroup, connections that improve fit for at least 349 50% of individuals in the subgroup are iteratively estimated for all participants in the subgroup 350 (Gates et al., 2017). After subgroup detection and connection estimation are complete, the group 351 352 and subgroup *a priori* models are used in the iterative data-driven estimation of individual-level 353 connections that uniquely characterize participants and improve their model fit. At each of these three steps, the algorithm stops its search when: a) the model fits well according to two out of 354 four fit statistics: Comparative Fit Index (CFI) \geq .95, Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) \geq .95, 355 356 Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) \leq .05 and Root Mean Square Error of 357 Approximation (RMSEA) \leq .05; or b) modification indices indicate no additional connections 358 will significantly improve fit- whichever comes first. The former is a stopping rule implemented to avoid overfitting. Given that the connections are inferred through the data-359 driven process from the temporal information in the fMRI data, the final maps reflect estimates 360 of directed functional connectivity (Beltz & Gates, 2017; Friston et al., 2013). 361 362 To characterize individual differences in GIMME-derived networks, we focus on subgroup membership and individual coefficients from the networks when examining links to 363 sensation seeking behavior. Subgroups are identified in GIMME (if they exist) and reflect 364

365 neural network similarities among some sets of participants during the MID continuous

366 motivational state. Each subgroup is characterized by a set of unique network connections, and

367 each has a person-specific beta estimate that reflects its strength and magnitude. These

individual subgroups and connection estimates can be examined in relation to the BSSS.

369 2.8 Analysis Plan

370 Event-related designs are often insufficiently powered to estimate the effects of specific task conditions (e.g., anticipation or feedback in the MID) on neural connectivity (see Beltz, 371 372 2018; Di & Biswal, 2017). This is especially true for *rapid* event-related designs, such as the current study's design, because the HRF is longer than the inter-stimulus interval. It is also 373 374 borne out by simulations using GIMME on task data (Duffy et al., 2021; Gates et al., 2011) and in empirical studies that modeled task regressors in GIMME and found little evidence for their 375 substantial modulating effects on connectivity (Hillary et al., 2014; Price et al., 2020). Given 376 377 this evidence, we focus on the connectivity among regions during a *motivational state* rather 378 than modeling modulation by specific task phases (e.g., during individual gain or loss events).

To test Aim 1, which was to examine whether there are data-driven subgroups during motivational processing, we use GIMME to map person-specific connectivity in reward ROIs separately for each run of the MID task, and then examine whether data-driven subgroups are identified. If subgroups are found, we will proceed to Aim 2.

383 To test Aim 2, which was to examine whether there are meaningful associations between network features (e.g., subgroup membership and connection strength) and sensation seeking, 384 we use logistic regression to evaluate whether BSSS (i.e., Wave 3 empirical Bayes intercepts 385 386 from the growth curve models) is significantly (p < .05) associated with the subgroups detected 387 from the first and second runs, separately. Specifically, we predict subgroup membership from 388 BSSS, controlling for age, sex, and head motion (mean framewise displacement, or FD). To 389 determine which subgroup connections may be driving links with sensation seeking, significant 390 associations are followed-up with exploratory multiple regression analyses – conducted within 391 each subgroup separately – to examine associations between specific connection strengths that are meaningful to the subgroup and BSSS. 392

Finally, to test Aim 3, we i) compare estimated connections between Run 01 and Run 02 to detect potential habituation across runs and ii) repeat Aims 1 and 2 for the concatenated timeseries to evaluate the robustness of neural connectivity and its BSSS associations in the full

time-series. Specifically, we: (a) examine whether data-driven subgroups are identified, and

then if subgroups are identified, we (b) use logistic regression to evaluate whether BSSS is

- 398 significantly (p < .05) associated with the subgroups and evaluate which subgroup connections
- may be driving links with BSSS with follow-up multiple regression analyses, as we did in Aim2.
- 401 We set the alpha cut-off (p < .05) that is conventionally used in null-hypothesis 402 significance testing for each of the regression analyses because of the novelty of these analyses. 403 This is consistent with recommendations for new analyses and recent perspectives on multiple 404 comparison corrections (e.g., Rubin, 2021; Thompson et al., 2020).
- 405 3. Results

Demographic characteristics, task accuracy and in-scanner motion during the MID task for participants are reported in supplementary Tables S2-S5, respectively. No participants had mean head motion (Post FD) greater than .20, and so based on prior recommendations (Park et al., 2018), no participants are excluded from analyses for this reason. Furthermore, BSSS was not significantly associated with mean post FD for Run 01, r(102) = .02, or Run 02, r(102) = .411 .05.

412 3.1 Aim 1: Person-specific Connectivity Networks by Run

For all 104 participants, GIMME networks fit the data well (see Supplemental Table S5). A summary of the final networks is shown in Figure 3; network connections for the group (black), subgroup (Subgroup01 = red; Subgroup02 = green), and individual (grey) connections are presented for each run of the MID. Solid lines represent contemporaneous connections, dashed lines represent lagged connections, and the weight of each line reflects the proportion of participants with that connection.

There were notable similarities and differences between the GIMME group-level networks for each run. For instance, there were consistent connections among the bilateral VS, amygdala and insula regions, L VS and ACC, L insula and L DLPFC, and R insula and ACC regions, but different connections between ACC and R DLPFC regions of the cognitive control network at the group-level. The GIMME community detection algorithm also identified two subgroups in each run of the MID, but the number of participants in each subgroup and the subgroup-level connections differed. For Run 01, 61 participants were in Subgroup01 and 43 participants were in Subgroup02. For Run 02, 56 participants were in Subgroup01 and 48 participants were grouped into Subgroup02. Notably, the majority of individuals who were grouped into Subgroup01 and Subgroup02 in the first run were also grouped into the same subgroup in the second run (Supplemental Table S6), suggesting some level of stability in subgroup membership between runs. Of note, there were no significant differences in age, sex, race/ethnicity, or sensation seeking across participants who did (N = 29) and did not (N = 75) change subgroups across the two runs (see supplemental Table S7).

For each run, the more homogeneous subgroup, Subgroup02, was represented by dense 433 within-reward-network connections and a greater number of connections between cognitive 434 control, reward and salience networks than the heterogeneous subgroup, Subgroup 01, which 435 had fewer subgroup connections. With respect to subgroup connections, patterns were relatively 436 437 consistent across runs. Participants in the heterogeneous subgroup, Subgroup01, had three subgroup-level connections during each run; two were the same and one differed, such that R 438 OFC \rightarrow vmPFC and vmPFC \rightarrow ACC connections reoccurred across the two runs, but L dlPFC 439 \rightarrow L Amygdala was unique to Run 01 and ACC \rightarrow R dlPFC was unique to Run 02. Participants 440 441 in the more homogeneous subgroup, Subgroup02, had nine and eight connections per run, respectively; they were similar except L Insula \rightarrow L Amygdala, R dlPFC \rightarrow L Amygdala, R and 442 OFC \rightarrow R VS only occurred in Run 01 and R OFC \rightarrow L OFC, L dlPFC \rightarrow L Amygdala only 443 occurred in Run 02 (see Table S8). 444



Figure 3. GIMME Connectivity Networks for Each Run.

Bhiska#tiglaujs dornteettad, kydcopsytoightupoll & ighteettosse, tyred n = Subgroup02 connections; Solid = Contemporaneous; Dashed = Lagged (t - 1); dlPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; OFC = orbitofrontal cortex; vmPFC = ventromedial PFC; VS = ventral striatum

446 3.2 Aim 2: Subgroup and Connection Strength Associations with Sensation Seeking

447 For Aim 2, we evaluated whether the subgroups identified in Aim 1 were related to BSSS. In a logistic regression model, there was a significant association between subgroup and 448 449 self-reported BSSS for Run 01 (b = 1.1), OR = 3.1 (see Table 1), such that a unit increase in 450 BSSS was associated with a 3.1:1 increase in the odds of being in Subgroup02, which is characterized by several subgroup level connections among reward and salience regions. The 451 model that included BSSS (AIC = 126.9) fit the data significantly better than the model without 452 BSSS (AIC = 131.4), $\Delta \gamma^2(1) = 4.7$, p = .03. Subgroups did not differ in age or sex, but they did 453 differ in FD, such that there was greater motion observed for participants in Subgroup02. This 454 455 effect is unchanged with (Table 1) and without the covariate of motion (e.g., mean Post FD) in the model (see supplementary Table S9). To consider the confound of motion, we checked 456 whether motion moderated the association between BSSS and subgroups. We found no 457 458 significant (p < .05) moderation of mean Post FD (see Supplemental Table S10).

459 Table 1: Logistic Regression: Sensation seeking

460 associated with GIMME-derived subgroup from MID task data, by run, with and without PostFD (N = 104)

401							
462		\leq	Run 01			Run 02	
463		В	SE	р	b	SE	р
464	A	► 10	17	20	11	17	10
465	Age	18	.1/	.28	11	.10	.48
466	Sex	.28	.43	.52	.80	.42	.06
467	PostFD	48.8	18.24	.008	29.4	15.84	.06
468	DCCC		55	04	50	51	26
469	0333		.55	.04	.38	.31	.20
_	DectED -	- Doot Dron	rococcin	a Eroma	mian Die	mlaama	

- 470 PostFD = Post Preprocessing Framewise Displacement;
 BSSS = Brief Sensation Seeking Scale
- 471

472 Subgroups also did not differ in age, sex, or FD.

There was not, however, a significant association between subgroup and self-reported BSSS from Run 02 (b = .58), OR = 1.8 (see Table 1), such that the model that included BSSS (AIC = 135.1) did not fit the data significantly better than the model without BSSS (AIC 136.4), $\Delta \chi^2(1)=1.3$, p = .25. Even though the direction of the effect was the same as in Run 01, such that sensation seeking was greater in Subgroup02, the size of the effect appeared to be attenuated in Run 02. Given the significant prediction of subgroup classification from BSSS in Run 01, with
Subgroup02 being linked to increased BSSS, we explored whether BSSS was associated with
person-specific beta weights (i.e., connection strength) of subgroup-level connections in

strength between the vmPFC and

R OFC (Figure 4B), and sensation



Figure 4. Meaningful associations between connection strength and sensation seeking in Subgroup02 during Run 01. (+) = sig. positive association; (-) = sig. negative association.

seeking was negatively associated with connectivity strength between R OFC and R VS (Figure 4C) – which are all regions that are associated with motivational processing (see Table S11). 3.3 Aim 3: Subgroup Associations with Sensation Seeking in Combined MID Runs We compared and contrasted GIMME results between the runs with GIMME results from the combined MID runs. Regarding comparisons between Run 01 and Run 02, there were notable differences (Figure 3). Although the group-level connections do not appear completely disparate between the two runs, only 55% of the group-level contemporaneous connections (solid black lines) re-occurred across both runs. Although, as noted above, there was some stability in subgroup membership between runs, the difference in membership was statistically significant, $\chi(1) = 18.1$, p < .001, $\Phi = .41$; only 72% (N = 44) of the participants were consistently grouped into Subgroup01, and 72% (N = 31) of participants were consistently grouped into Subgroup02 (Supplemental Table S6). Regarding analyses of the combined runs, the GIMME networks fit the data well for all

participants except one (see Table S12; Figure S4), thus N = 103 in these analyses. For this

504 participant, the model did not converge. As for the analyses conducted separately per run, two subgroups were identified. The number of participants differed across each subgroup, with 34 in 505 506 Subgroup01 and 69 in Subgroup02. Subgroups were comparable in the number of subgrouplevel connections estimated for Subgroup01 and Subgroup02, with 19 and 16 connections, 507 respectively. Both Subgroup01 and Subgroup02 had connections within the reward and salience 508 networks as well as dense network connections between reward, salience, and cognitive control. 509 510 When examining whether self-reported BSSS predicted subgroup membership, there was not a significant effect (b = -51; supplemental Table S13), such that the model that included BSSS 511 (AIC = 129.6) did not fit the data significantly better than the model without BSSS (AIC 130.5), 512 $\Delta \gamma^2(1)=0.9$, p=.33. This suggests that the positive association between sensation seeking and 513 subgroups that was present for Run 01 was not reflected when the runs were combined. 514

515 4. Discussion

We used a person-specific network connectivity analysis approach, GIMME (Gates & 516 Molenaar, 2012), to evaluate a central question in the study of adolescent risk taking: Do 517 individual differences in neural network connectivity during a continuous motivational 518 519 processing task meaningfully relate to self-reported sensation seeking behavior? Specifically, 520 we examined whether and how connectivity during two runs of a commonly used reward task 521 (i.e., Monetary Incentive Delay; Knutson et al., 2000) differed between data-derived subgroups 522 of youth in late adolescence in ways related to sensation seeking (calculated as the endpoint 523 intercept of a 3-wave behavioral trajectory across adolescence). To examine possible 524 habituation effects, we considered how neural subgrouping and behavioral associations varied 525 across runs, and compared this approach with analyses that combined the runs. We found that 526 there were two data-derived subgroups in each run and that subgroup-level network connections 527 were meaningfully associated with sensation seeking in the first run only. These associations 528 were not detected when the runs were combined for analysis. To our knowledge, this is the first investigation of adolescent-specific network connectivity mapping during a motivational state 529 530 with significant links to risk-relevant behavior.

In light of evidence for the neural habituation to reward across time (Plichta et al., 2012;
Ekhtiari et al., 2020), we examined person-specific connectivity during continuous motivational
processing separately for runs of the MID task in a sparse network of 12 ROIs representing

534 cognitive control, reward, and salience networks. We found that the majority of group-level 535 connections reoccurred across runs reflecting some level of stability across connections 536 meaningful to all individuals. Then, for each MID run the GIMME algorithm identified two 537 subgroups. Although subgroup membership significantly differed across the runs, the majority of individuals grouped in each of the subgroups in Run 01 (72%) were also grouped in the 538 539 corresponding subgroup in Run 02, suggesting some degree of stability in subgroup-specific 540 neural connectivity features over the course of the task. Subgroup01 had greater heterogeneity 541 (only three subgroup connections during each run) than Subgroup02, which had nine and eight subgroup connections across Run 01 and Run 02, respectively. This suggests that while there is 542 543 heterogeneity in adolescent brain activity during motivational processing, there are also some meaningful commonalities across subgroups of adolescents. 544

With respect to sensation seeking, when modeling each run separately, we found a 545 significant association between community-based subgroups and self-reported sensation 546 seeking. Specifically, our analyses revealed that the more homogenous subgroup, Subgroup02, 547 548 had significantly higher sensation seeking than Subgroup01. This effect, however, was only 549 significant when subgroups were defined in the first run, suggesting that changes in subgroup membership across the runs may have impacted associations with sensation seeking. Similar to 550 551 prior work that found associations between OFC connectivity and motivational traits (Crane et 552 al., 2018; Wan et al., 2020), we found a significant positive association in connectivity strength 553 between vmPFC—Right OFC and sensation seeking, and a negative association in connectivity 554 strength between Right OFC—Right VS and sensation seeking for Subgroup02 during Run 01, 555 but not Run 02. Interestingly, activation contralateral to the latter brain regions, Left OFC and Left VS, during reward expectancy has been reported to relate to impulsive sensation seeking in 556 557 a young adult sample (Chase et al., 2017). This may suggest that the OFC, which is important 558 for stimulus-value representations, tracking internal values, and goal-directed and affective behavior (Haber & Behrens, 2014; Padoa-Schioppa & Conen, 2017; Szczepanski & Knight, 559 2014), may be relevant for individual differences in reward seeking, but only for a specific 560 561 subset of adolescents. Given the exploratory nature of this finding, it requires further 562 investigation and replication in future work.

There were other important differences across runs. Although 72% of participants
maintained their subgroup assignments across runs (i.e., were in the homogeneous subgroup in

565 both runs or the heterogeneous subgroup in both runs), the differences in grouping between runs 566 appear to be meaningful because the association with sensation seeking decreased from the first 567 to the second. This is consistent with recent findings, indicating that some of this decrease may 568 be attributable to habituation (Elliott et al., 2020; Plichta et al., 2012), which is especially relevant to reward regions modeled here (Ekhtiari et al., 2020). Specifically, motivation towards 569 570 approaching and receiving rewards may be attenuated with repeated runs due to strategic 571 changes in attentional processes (Failing & Theeuwes, 2018) and/or become habitual over time (Michaelsen & Esch, 2021). This might be reflected in the dynamics of reward, salience and 572 cognitive control networks that consequently decrease the association of neural features with 573

574 reward relevant behaviors.

575 It is also possible that the variability across runs may be due to issues of reliability. For 576 instance, recent work has demonstrated that both task-based fMRI (Elliott et al., 2020) and 577 resting state connectivity (Noble et al., 2019) suffer from poor test-retest reliability. Poor test-578 retest reliability may impact both subgroup partitioning (Gates et al., 2016; Pons & Latapy, 579 2005) and the association between network connectivity and sensation seeking. This presents a 580 challenge when trying to determine whether differences across runs relate to habituation, motivation, reliability, or a mixture of all three. An ongoing project is evaluating the reliability 581 582 of GIMME's directed connectivity estimates amongst different brain regions, but the test-retest 583 reliability of GIMME's subgrouping algorithm has not been well investigated and so remains an 584 important question for future research.

When we repeated our analyses using the combined MID runs, we found further changes 585 586 in subgroup memberships as well as with subgroup associations with sensation seeking. While 587 two subgroups were, again, detected in combined runs, these two subgroups were both more 588 homogeneous and represented by more connections between reward, salience, and cognitive 589 control networks than when the runs were analyzed separately. Moreover, the subgroup 590 association with sensation seeking was not significant and negative; this is a striking deviation 591 from the significant and positive association in Run 01 and even the positive (but non-592 significant) association in Run 02. This stark difference might reflect methodological artifacts, 593 such as greater signal quality and stability with a longer duration scan (Gordon et al., 2017), or greater statistical power, which would be expected to cause more connections to be estimated at 594 595 the subgroup level, rather than individual level, because the 50% threshold for subgroup

596 connections becomes easier to meet. GIMME adds connections interactively at the group and 597 subgroup level that are significant (p < .01) for a large proportion of individuals (75% and 50%) 598 for the group and subgroup levels, respectively). Likewise, the model at the individual level 599 retains/adds connections that meet the significance threshold and then the model fit criterion threshold (Gates & Molenaar, 2012). By doubling our time-series data (concatenating runs), this 600 601 increases the likelihood that a connection would have been incorporated into the group and 602 subgroup level models, especially in scenarios where connections were near the significance threshold in the shorter time series. Future connectivity work should consider issues of power 603 and simultaneous changes stemming from individual differences across the time-series. 604

While issues of reliability are important, differences across runs may also reflect 605 meaningful individual differences in how network dynamics change across time. For example, 606 607 connectivity patterns have been shown to reflect some variability in individuals across runs in both static and dynamic networks (Fong et al., 2019). Moreover, it appears likely that the 608 609 variability across runs may have both influenced subgroup partitioning (Gates et al., 2016; Pons & Latapy, 2005) and the association between network connectivity and sensation seeking. 610 611 Future work should reconsider these associations in the context of test-retest of network connectivity metrics (Beck & Jackson, 2020), the specific assumptions of GIMME, and the 612 613 effect of different fMRI protocols, such as non-multiband data, different head motion corrections, and alternative reward, salience and cognitive control ROI coordinates. 614

615 An important consideration in study is that participants were in a presumed general *motivational state* during the MID task, in which neural mechanisms involved in the processing 616 617 of both gains and losses were consistently engaged, with potentially overlapping neural 618 perturbations. Our reported estimates of directed functional connectivity during the MID task is 619 therefore distinct from the field's common focus on average contrasts of anticipatory or 620 outcome reward cues or the comparison of neural activation during gain versus loss trials (Demidenko et al., 2021; Dugré et al., 2018; Oldham et al., 2018). Thus, the ways in which our 621 specific findings map onto established findings in the field regarding reward processing is 622 623 currently unclear. It is important, however, to highlight that there is empirical support for 624 examining motivational processing as we did because gain and loss cues in the MID design exhibit substantial overlap in neural activation (Murray et al., 2020; Oldham et al., 2018), and 625 626 brain function involves continuous time-lagged brain states (Munn et al., 2021), with

627 "carryover" effects that are often assumed to be random (e.g., if jitter is implemented correctly)
628 – but this is rarely examined. Nevertheless, the complex issue of reward circuitry and
629 motivational processing during task-based fMRI requires careful theoretical and empirical
630 future work to understand and disentangle.

In addition to generalizing the results reported here, future work should consider how 631 variability in task length, number of runs, task type and region selection impact findings. Some 632 researchers have proposed that increasing the amount of data, or task length (Gordon et al., 633 2017), and aggregating across modalities (Elliott et al., 2019) may improve reliability and 634 generalizability. Although these suggestions certainly have merit, there may be an inherent 635 636 trade-off between the measurement improvements that result from increasing the length of a task, and measurement decrements that occur due to habituation or other state-related changes 637 638 linked to longer tasks. Furthermore, cognitive states induced by different tasks have been shown to be characterized by different connectivity patterns explaining different amounts of variance 639 in behavior (Greene et al., 2018). Hence, considering how group-, subgroup- and individual-640 level network patterns may vary across the course of reward tasks and the impact of this 641 642 variability on sensation seeking may facilitate the field's understanding of adolescent risk taking. Finally, we use a priori ROIs from the adolescent literature in our analyses, and this 643 clearly constrains our results. Specifically, recent evidence from the resting state literature 644 645 demonstrates that ROI parcellations may impact the underlying associations and interpretations 646 (Bryce et al., 2021). Thus, future work should consider alternative ROIs and parcellations to test these and related hypotheses. 647

648 4.1 Study Considerations

649 The findings reported here are not without limitations. First, major issue in fMRI is the 650 effect of head motion on the quality of the underlying neural signal (Parkes et al., 2018; Power 651 et al., 2014; Siegel et al., 2014). Although we used standard task-based fMRI motion correction (Park et al., 2018), motion may still have impacted the underlying signal. This is especially of 652 653 concern given that head motion was significantly related to the Subgroups identified. However, we compared our models with and without the covariate of head motion and the moderating 654 655 effect of motion on the association between sensation seeking and subgroups and found our 656 interpretations did not meaningfully change. Nonetheless, future work should consider how

different head motion correction strategies may influence the estimation of person-specificnetworks.

659 Second, although the main sample used here is two times greater than the median 660 sample used in neuroimaging studies (Szucs & Ioannidis, 2020), the analyses focused on the brain-behavior associations for Subgroup02 were smaller, and therefore, may be less robust than 661 662 results involving the full sample. Given the issues of reliability and power in fMRI analyses 663 (Button et al., 2013; Elliott et al., 2020; Noble et al., 2019; Szucs & Ioannidis, 2017), we cannot extrapolate our exploratory analyses examining the association between specific connection 664 strengths and BSSS. As such, these results warrant replication in an independent sample. The 665 issue of power was also critical to consider when weighing the pros and cons of modeling the 666 coactivation of brain regions during a *motivational state* rather than the modulating effect of 667 specific task regressors. Ultimately, choosing not to model task regressors during functional 668 connectivity sacrifices the knowledge about the effects of different phases of reward processing. 669 670 However, as in most analyses, we had to consider the conceptual and statistical trades-offs of 671 our decision. Our goal was to assess the dynamic engagement of respective brain regions during 672 motivational processes that are important to neurodevelopmental heuristics (Casey et al., 2019). Our related, statistical goal was to model coactivation among regions in a way that was 673 informed by prior literature and adequately powered. Although task regressors are included in 674 675 psychophysiological interaction analyses (PPI; McLaren et al., 2012), it has been reported that 676 most modulating effects are small and statistically noisy, and therefore, require substantial power accomplished through task lengths and sample sizes in fMRI studies (Di & Biswal, 677 678 2017). Consistent with these group-level analyses in PPI, simulation studies of GIMME demonstrate that issues of power can prevent the detection of small task modulating effects, 679 680 especially in rapid event-related designs like that used in the current study (Duffy et al., 2021; 681 Gates et al., 2011). Thus, we encourage future studies to build on our empirical findings by considering the effect of task modulation in designs that are well powered to do so, such as 682 through the creation and implementation of a slow-event-related MID task. 683

Third, the networks are based on several key *a priori* ROIs. Although GIMME
simulations have demonstrated that omission of variables (i.e., the third variable problem) does
not greatly impact recovery of connections (Gates et al., 2017), future work should consider

how subgrouping and connection strength are altered when using different combinations ofregions.

Fourth, due to some missing sensation seeking data, we used full information maximum likelihood to estimate a sensation seeking score at Wave 3 (closest to when neuroimaging was conducted) for all individuals. This strategy may have introduced additional noise into our models, especially if missingness was related to an unaccounted variable. However, the strategy also allowed us to maximize our sample size (i.e., by not excluding participants with missing Wave 3 data), and our estimated intercept was significantly related to the observed data increasing our confidence in the observed associations.

696 Although our study is based on a tenet of the imbalance hypothesis and we found a significant brain-behavior relation, findings cannot be seamlessly extrapolated to other datasets, 697 698 modeling sequences, or to real-world risk-taking behavior and age-related differences without further research. This is because we used a partially data-driven approach when fitting neural 699 700 networks and did not have a second, similar dataset available for cross-validation. Indeed, 701 recent evidence in fMRI demonstrates that brain parcellations (Bryce et al., 2021), analytic 702 pipelines (Botvinik-Nezer et al., 2019; Li et al., 2021) and other potentially subjective researcher decisions (Bloom et al., 2021; Steegen et al., 2016) impact results; hence, it is 703 imperative that future work replicates these results in other adolescent samples, with other tasks 704 705 that probe motivational processing, and using other preprocessing pipelines. Second, 706 associations between self-reported sensation seeking and real-world risk-taking are often smallto-medium in adolescent samples (Demidenko et al., 2019). Instead, our findings represent the 707 708 link between brain function during motivational processing and a psychological trait hypothesized to relate to real-world risk-taking behaviors. While there were not meaningful 709 710 associations between age and connectivity patterns in this work, prior work has reported 711 developmental differences in connectivity patterns (Marek et al., 2015; Oldham & Fornito, 712 2019) which future studies should consider. Moreover, while both habituation and reliability issues are plausible explanations for the difference in the association between subgroups and 713 714 sensation seeking across runs, we cannot delineate which is more probable, given that this 715 version of the MID task did not capture all mean response times and the reliability of fMRI connectivity (generally) and GIMME (specifically) are still being evaluated. This will be an 716

717 important consideration in future work modeling functional connectivity across multiple runs of718 reward tasks.

719 4.2 Conclusions

720 This study is among the first to evaluate a central tenet of the developmental imbalance 721 hypothesis using a data-driven person-specific network connectivity approach that characterizes 722 group-, subgroup- and individual-level connections. When mapping sparse networks of connections among cognitive control and socioemotional ROIs during motivational processing, 723 724 we found two subgroups - one "homogenous" with a greater number of shared connections, and 725 one "heterogeneous" with fewer shared connections – with the homogeneous group having 726 higher self-reported sensation seeking than the heterogeneous group. Further, the strengths of 727 select homogeneous subgroup connections, such as the Right OFC—Right VS and vmPFC— Right OFC, were negatively and positively associated with self-reported sensation seeking, 728 729 respectively. This implies that reward related behaviors are meaningfully related to connectivity 730 patterns derived from person-specific connectivity patterns. Note, however, brain-behavior 731 relations varied by run, such that connectivity between reward regions was significantly related 732 to sensation seeking only during the first run, but not the second run or when the runs were combined. These findings suggest young adults that report greater sensation seeking may share 733 unique patterns of functional connectivity during motivational processing and these patterns 734 735 may attenuate with repeated stimulation, perhaps due to habituation to the task or reliability across runs. 736

737

Acknowledgments. This research was supported, in part, by a grant from the *Eunice Kennedy* 738 739 Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development (NICHD; R01HD075806, D.P. Keating, Principal Investigator). M. Demidenko was also supported by the NICHD 740 741 Developmental Psychology Training Grant (5T32HD007109-34, V.C. McLoyd & C.S. Monk). A. Weigard was supported by NIAAA T32 AA007477 (Dr. Frederic C. Blow) and NIDA K23 742 743 DA051561. A. Beltz was supported by the Jacobs Foundation. The authors thank Bennet 744 Fauber, Krisanne Litinas, Christine Wagner, Hani Nasr, Peter Batra, Joshua Hatfield, Meredith 745 House, Kyle Kwaiser, Kathleen LaDronka, the U-M Survey Research Operations staff, and the 746 U-M MRI Laboratory, for their support in collecting this data. The authors also thank Karthik Ganesan for the Matlab script to overlay regions of interest on a MNI glass brain. 747

748	Author's Contribution. MD conceived the study; MD & AB conducted the statistical analysis				
749	and wrote the initial draft of the manuscript with critical assistance from AW. DK and EH				
750	designed and executed the study and data collection and provided critical feedback on the				
751	manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.				
752	Data Sharing: Readers seeking access to this data should contact Dr. Daniel Keating				
753	(keatingd@umich.edu) or Michael Demidenko (demidenm@umich.edu). Access will be granted				
754	to named individuals in accordance with ethical procedures governing the reuse of sensitive				
755	data. Infrastructure is currently being developed in collaboration with the Inter-university				
756	Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan				
757	(https://www.icpsr.umich.edu) to archive and share data in an ethically approved manner and				
758	will be shared at a later TBD date.				
759					
760					
761	References				
762	Apps, M. A. J., Rushworth, M. F. S., & Chang, S. W. C. (2016). The Anterior Cingulate Gyrus and				
763	Social Cognition: Tracking the Motivation of Others. <i>Neuron, 90</i> (4), 692–707.				
764	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2016.04.018				
765	Arnett, J. (1994). Sensation seeking: A new conceptualization and a new scale. Personality and				
766	Individual Differences, 16(2), 289–296. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)90165-1				
767	Balodis, I. M., & Potenza, M. N. (2015). Anticipatory Reward Processing in Addicted				
768	Populations: A Focus on the Monetary Incentive Delay Task. Biological Psychiatry,				
769	77(5), 434–444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2014.08.020				
770	Becht, A. I., & Mills, K. L. (2020). Modeling Individual Differences in Brain Development.				
771	Biological Psychiatry. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2020.01.027				
772	Beck, E. D., & Jackson, J. J. (2020). Consistency and change in idiographic personality: A				
773	longitudinal ESM network study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 118(5),				
774	1080–1100. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000249				
775	Beltz, A. M. (2018). Connecting Theory and Methods in Adolescent Brain Research. Journal of				
776	<i>Research on Adolescence, 28</i> (1), 10–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12366				

- 777
 Beltz, A. M., & Gates, K. M. (2017). Network Mapping with GIMME. *Multivariate Behavioral*

 778
 Research, 52(6), 789–804. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2017.1373014

 779
 Distribution

 770
 Distribution

 771
 Distribution

 772
 Distribution

 773
 Distribution

 774
 Distribution

 775
 Distribution

 776
 Distribution

 777
 Distribution

 778
 Distribution

 779
 Distribution

 770
 Distribution

 771
 Distribution

 772
 Distribution
 Distribution

 773
 Distribution
 Distribution
 Distribution

 773
 Distribution
 Distribution
 Distribution

 774
 Distribution
 Distribution
 Distribution

 775
 Distribution
 Distribution
 Distribution

 775
 Distribution
 Distribution
 Distribution

 776
 Distribution
 Distribution
 Distribution

 777
 Distribution
 Distribution
- 779 Beltz, A. M., Gates, K. M., Engels, A. S., Molenaar, P. C. M., Pulido, C., Turrisi, R., Berenbaum, S.
- 780 A., Gilmore, R. O., & Wilson, S. J. (2013). Changes in Alcohol-Related Brain Networks
- 781 Across the First Year of College: A Prospective Pilot Study Using fMRI Effective
- 782 Connectivity Mapping. *Addictive Behaviors*, *38*(4), 2052–2059.
- 783 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2012.12.023
- Beltz, A. M., & Weigard, A. (2019). Methodological Advances in Leveraging Neuroimaging
 Datasets in Adolescent Substance Use Research. *Current Addiction Reports*, 6(4), 495–
 503. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40429-019-00275-x
- 787 Berridge, K. C. (2019). Affective valence in the brain: Modules or modes? *Nature Reviews*788 *Neuroscience*, 20(4), 225–234. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-019-0122-8
- Bjork, J. M., & Pardini, D. A. (2015). Who are those "risk-taking adolescents"? Individual
 differences in developmental neuroimaging research. *Developmental Cognitive*
- 791 *Neuroscience, 11,* 56–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2014.07.008
- 792 Bjork, J. M., Smith, A. R., Chen, G., & Hommer, D. W. (2010). Adolescents, Adults and Rewards:
- 793 Comparing Motivational Neurocircuitry Recruitment Using fMRI. PLOS ONE, 5(7),
- 794 e11440. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0011440
- 795 Bloom, P. A., VanTieghem, M., Gabard-Durnam, L., Gee, D. G., Flannery, J., Caldera, C., Goff, B.,
- 796 Telzer, E. H., Humphreys, K. L., Fareri, D. S., Shapiro, M., Algharazi, S., Bolger, N., Aly,
- 797 M., & Tottenham, N. (2021). Age-related change in task-evoked amygdala-prefrontal
- *circuitry: A multiverse approach with an accelerated longitudinal cohort aged 4-22 years* (p. 2021.10.08.463601). https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.08.463601
- 800 Botvinik-Nezer, R., Holzmeister, F., Camerer, C. F., Dreber, A., Huber, J., Johannesson, M.,
- 801 Kirchler, M., Iwanir, R., Mumford, J. A., Adcock, A., Avesani, P., Baczkowski, B.,
- 802 Bajracharya, A., Bakst, L., Ball, S., Barilari, M., Bault, N., Beaton, D., Beitner, J., ...
- 803 Schonberg, T. (2019). Variability in the analysis of a single neuroimaging dataset by
- 804 many teams. *BioRxiv*, 843193. https://doi.org/10.1101/843193

- 805 Bryce, N. V., Flournoy, J. C., Guassi Moreira, J. F., Rosen, M. L., Sambook, K. A., Mair, P., &
- 806 McLaughlin, K. A. (2021). Brain parcellation selection: An overlooked decision point
- 807 with meaningful effects on individual differences in resting-state functional
- 808 connectivity. *NeuroImage*, *243*, 118487.
- 809 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2021.118487
- 810 Button, K. S., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Mokrysz, C., Nosek, B. A., Flint, J., Robinson, E. S. J., & Munafò,
- 811 M. R. (2013). Power failure: Why small sample size undermines the reliability of
- 812 neuroscience. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *14*(5), 365–376.
- 813 https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3475
- 814 Casey, B. J. (2015). Beyond simple models of self-control to circuit-based accounts of
- adolescent behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*, 295–319.
- 816 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015156
- 817 Casey, B. J., Cannonier, T., Conley, M. I., Cohen, A. O., Barch, D. M., Heitzeg, M. M., Soules, M.
- 818 E., Teslovich, T., Dellarco, D. V., Garavan, H., Orr, C. A., Wager, T. D., Banich, M. T.,
- 819 Speer, N. K., Sutherland, M. T., Riedel, M. C., Dick, A. S., Bjork, J. M., Thomas, K. M., ...
- ABCD Imaging Acquisition Workgroup. (2018). The Adolescent Brain Cognitive
- 821 Development (ABCD) study: Imaging acquisition across 21 sites. *Developmental*
- 822 *Cognitive Neuroscience*, *32*, 43–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.03.001
- 823 Casey, B. J., Getz, S., & Galvan, A. (2008). The adolescent brain. Developmental Review : DR,
- 824 28(1), 62–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.003
- Casey, B. J., Heller, A. S., Gee, D. G., & Cohen, A. O. (2019). Development of the emotional
- 826 brain. Neuroscience Letters, 693, 29–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2017.11.055
- 827 Chase, H. W., Fournier, J. C., Bertocci, M. A., Greenberg, T., Aslam, H., Stiffler, R., Lockovich, J.,
- 828 Graur, S., Bebko, G., Forbes, E. E., & Phillips, M. L. (2017). A pathway linking reward
- 829 circuitry, impulsive sensation-seeking and risky decision-making in young adults:
- 830 Identifying neural markers for new interventions. *Translational Psychiatry*, 7(4), e1096–
- e1096. https://doi.org/10.1038/tp.2017.60
- Crane, N. A., Gorka, S. M., Phan, K. L., & Childs, E. (2018). Amygdala-orbitofrontal functional
 connectivity mediates the relationship between sensation seeking and alcohol use

834

- 835 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.07.044
- 836 Demidenko, M. I., Huntley, E. D., Jahn, A., Thomason, M. E., Monk, C. S., & Keating, D. P.
- 837 (2020). Cortical and subcortical response to the anticipation of reward in high and
- 838 average/low risk-taking adolescents. Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience, 44,
- 839 100798. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2020.100798
- Demidenko, M. I., Huntley, E. D., Martz, M. E., & Keating, D. P. (2019). Adolescent Health Risk
- 841 Behaviors: Convergent, Discriminant and Predictive Validity of Self-Report and
- 842 Cognitive Measures. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *48*(9), 1765–1783.
- 843 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01057-4
- Demidenko, M. I., Weigard, A. S., Ganesan, K., Jang, H., Jahn, A., Huntley, E. D., & Keating, D. P.
- 845(2021). Interactions between methodological and interindividual variability: How846Monetary Incentive Delay (MID) task contrast maps vary and impact associations with
- 847 behavior. *Brain and Behavior*, 11(5), e02093. https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.2093
- Di, X., & Biswal, B. B. (2017). Psychophysiological Interactions in a Visual Checkerboard Task:
- Reproducibility, Reliability, and the Effects of Deconvolution. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*,
 11, 573. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2017.00573
- 851 Duffy, K. A., Fisher, Z. F., Arizmendi, C. A., Molenaar, P. C. M., Hopfinger, J., Cohen, J. R., Beltz,
- A. M., Lindquist, M. A., Hallquist, M. N., & Gates, K. M. (2021). Detecting Task-
- 853 Dependent Functional Connectivity in Group Iterative Multiple Model Estimation with
- 854 Person-Specific Hemodynamic Response Functions. *Brain Connectivity*, *11*(6), 418–429.
- 855 https://doi.org/10.1089/brain.2020.0864
- Dugré, J. R., Dumais, A., Bitar, N., & Potvin, S. (2018). Loss anticipation and outcome during the
 Monetary Incentive Delay Task: A neuroimaging systematic review and meta-analysis.
 PeerJ, 6, e4749. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.4749
- 859 Ekhtiari, H., Kuplicki, R., Aupperle, R. P., & Paulus, M. P. (2020). It is Never as Good the Second
 860 Time Around: Brain Areas Involved in Salience Processing Habituate During Repeated
- 861 Drug Cue Exposure in Methamphetamine and Opioid Users. *BioRxiv*,
- 862 2020.04.18.036368. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.18.036368

- 863 Elliott, M. L., Knodt, A. R., Ireland, D., Morris, M. L., Poulton, R., Ramrakha, S., Sison, M. L.,
- 864 Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., & Hariri, A. R. (2020). What Is the Test-Retest Reliability of
- 865 Common Task-Functional MRI Measures? New Empirical Evidence and a Meta-Analysis:
- 866 *Psychological Science*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620916786
- 867 Ernst, M. (2014). The triadic model perspective for the study of adolescent motivated
 868 behavior. *Brain and Cognition*, *89*, 104–111.
- 869 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2014.01.006
- 870 Ernst, M., Pine, D. S., & Hardin, M. (2006). Triadic model of the neurobiology of motivated
 871 behavior in adolescence. *Psychological Medicine*, *36*(3), 299–312.
- 872 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291705005891
- 873 Ernst, M., & Spear, L. P. (2009). Reward systems. In *Handbook of developmental social* 874 *neuroscience* (pp. 324–341). The Guilford Press.
- 875 Failing, M., & Theeuwes, J. (2018). Selection history: How reward modulates selectivity of
- visual attention. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25(2), 514–538.
- 877 https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1380-y
- 878 Finn, E. S., Scheinost, D., Finn, D. M., Shen, X., Papademetris, X., & Constable, R. T. (2017). Can
- 879 brain state be manipulated to emphasize individual differences in functional
- 880 connectivity? *NeuroImage*, *160*, 140–151.
- 881 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.03.064
- 882 Fong, A. H. C., Yoo, K., Rosenberg, M. D., Zhang, S., Li, C.-S. R., Scheinost, D., Constable, R. T., &
- 883 Chun, M. M. (2019). Dynamic functional connectivity during task performance and rest
- 884 predicts individual differences in attention across studies. *NeuroImage*, *188*, 14–25.
- 885 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.11.057
- Friston, K., Moran, R., & Seth, A. K. (2013). Analysing connectivity with Granger causality and
 dynamic causal modelling. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 23(2), 172–178.
- 888 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2012.11.010
- 689 Galvan, A. (2010). Adolescent development of the reward system. *Frontiers in Human*

890 Neuroscience, 4, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/neuro.09.006.2010

- Galvan, A., Hare, T., Voss, H., Glover, G., & Casey, B. J. (2007). Risk-taking and the adolescent
- brain: Who is at risk? *Developmental Science*, *10*(2), F8–F14.
- 893 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2006.00579.x
- 894 Galván, A., & McGlennen, K. M. (2012). Enhanced Striatal Sensitivity to Aversive
- 895 Reinforcement in Adolescents versus Adults. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 25(2),
- 896 284–296. https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00326
- Gates, K. M., Henry, T., Steinley, D., & Fair, D. A. (2016). A Monte Carlo Evaluation of Weighted
 Community Detection Algorithms. *Frontiers in Neuroinformatics*, *10*, 45.
- 899 https://doi.org/10.3389/fninf.2016.00045
- 900 Gates, K. M., Lane, S. T., Varangis, E., Giovanello, K., & Guiskewicz, K. (2017). Unsupervised
- 901 Classification During Time-Series Model Building. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*,
- 902 52(2), 129–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2016.1256187
- 903 Gates, K. M., & Molenaar, P. C. M. (2012). Group search algorithm recovers effective
- 904 connectivity maps for individuals in homogeneous and heterogeneous samples.
- 905 *NeuroImage*, *63*(1), 310–319. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.06.026
- 906 Gates, K. M., Molenaar, P. C. M., Hillary, F. G., & Slobounov, S. (2011). Extended unified SEM
- 907 approach for modeling event-related fMRI data. *NeuroImage*, *54*(2), 1151–1158.
- 908 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.08.051
- 909 Glover, G. H., Li, T. Q., & Ress, D. (2000). Image-based method for retrospective correction of
- 910 physiological motion effects in fMRI: RETROICOR. *Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*,

911 44(1), 162–167. https://doi.org/10.1002/1522-2594(200007)44:1<162::aid-

912 mrm23>3.0.co;2-e

- Goetschius, L. G., Hein, T. C., McLanahan, S. S., Brooks-Gunn, J., McLoyd, V. C., Dotterer, H. L.,
 Lopez-Duran, N., Mitchell, C., Hyde, L. W., Monk, C. S., & Beltz, A. M. (2020).
- 915 Association of Childhood Violence Exposure With Adolescent Neural Network Density.
 916 JAMA Network Open, 3(9). https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.17850
- 917 Gordon, E. M., Laumann, T. O., Gilmore, A. W., Newbold, D. J., Greene, D. J., Berg, J. J., Ortega,
- 918 M., Hoyt-Drazen, C., Gratton, C., Sun, H., Hampton, J. M., Coalson, R. S., Nguyen, A. L.,
- 919 McDermott, K. B., Shimony, J. S., Snyder, A. Z., Schlaggar, B. L., Petersen, S. E., Nelson,

- S. M., & Dosenbach, N. U. F. (2017). Precision Functional Mapping of Individual Human
 Brains. *Neuron*, *95*(4), 791-807.e7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.07.011
- 922 Greene, A. S., Gao, S., Scheinost, D., & Constable, R. T. (2018). Task-induced brain state
- 923 manipulation improves prediction of individual traits. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 1–
 924 13. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04920-3
- 925 Haber, S. N., & Behrens, T. E. J. (2014). The Neural Network Underlying Incentive-Based
- 926 Learning: Implications for Interpreting Circuit Disruptions in Psychiatric Disorders.

```
927 Neuron, 83(5), 1019–1039. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.08.031
```

- Haber, S. N., & Knutson, B. (2010). The Reward Circuit: Linking Primate Anatomy and Human
 Imaging. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 35(1), 4–26.
- 930 https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2009.129
- Harden, K. P., & Tucker-Drob, E. M. (2011). Individual differences in the development of
- 932 sensation seeking and impulsivity during adolescence: Further evidence for a dual
- 933 systems model. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(3), 739–746.
- 934 https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023279
- Henry, T. R., Feczko, E., Cordova, M., Earl, E., Williams, S., Nigg, J. T., Fair, D. A., & Gates, K. M.
- 936 (2019). Comparing directed functional connectivity between groups with confirmatory
 937 subgrouping GIMME. *NeuroImage*, *188*, 642–653.
- 938 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.12.040
- Hillary, F. G., Medaglia, J. D., Gates, K. M., Molenaar, P. C., & Good, D. C. (2014). Examining
 network dynamics after traumatic brain injury using the extended unified SEM
- 941 approach. Brain Imaging and Behavior, 8(3), 435–445. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11682942 012-9205-0
- Horvath, P., & Zuckerman, M. (1993). Sensation seeking, risk appraisal, and risky behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 14(1), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/01918869(93)90173-Z
- Hoyle, R. H., Stephenson, M. T., Palmgreen, P., Lorch, E. P., & Donohew, R. L. (2002). Reliability
 and validity of a brief measure of sensation seeking. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *32*(3), 401–414. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00032-0

- Jenkinson, M., Bannister, P., Brady, M., & Smith, S. (2002). Improved optimization for the
 robust and accurate linear registration and motion correction of brain images.
 NeuroImage, *17*(2), 825–841.
- Jenkinson, M., & Smith, S. (2001). A global optimisation method for robust affine registration
 of brain images. *Medical Image Analysis*, 5(2), 143–156.
- Kann, L., McManus, T., Harris, W. A., Shanklin, S. L., Flint, K. H., Queen, B., Lowry, R., Chyen, D.,
 Whittle, L., Thornton, J., Lim, C., Bradford, D., Yamakawa, Y., Leon, M., Brener, N., &
- 956 Ethier, K. A. (2018). Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance—United States, 2017. *Morbidity*
- 957 and Mortality Weekly Report. Surveillance Summaries (Washington, D.C.: 2002), 67(8),
- 958 1–114. https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.ss6708a1
- 959 Khurana, A., Romer, D., Betancourt, L. M., & Hurt, H. (2018). Modeling Trajectories of
- 960 Sensation Seeking and Impulsivity Dimensions from Early to Late Adolescence:
- 961 Universal Trends or Distinct Sub-groups? Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47(9),
- 962 1992–2005. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0891-9
- Knutson, B., & Greer, S. (2008). Anticipatory affect: Neural correlates and consequences for
 choice. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,

965 363(1511), 3771–3786. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0155

- Knutson, B., Katovich, K., & Suri, G. (2014). Inferring affect from fMRI data. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18(8), 422–428. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.04.006
- Knutson, B., Westdorp, A., Kaiser, E., & Hommer, D. (2000). FMRI visualization of brain activity
 during a monetary incentive delay task. *NeuroImage*, *12*(1), 20–27.
- 970 https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2000.0593
- Lane, S. T., Gates, K. M., Pike, H. K., Beltz, A. M., & Wright, A. G. C. (2019). Uncovering general,
 shared, and unique temporal patterns in ambulatory assessment data. *Psychological Methods*, 24(1), 54–69. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000192
- *inetious*, 24(1), 54–65. https://doi.org/10.103//inet0000192
- 274 Li, X., Ai, L., Giavasis, S., Jin, H., Feczko, E., Xu, T., Clucas, J., Franco, A., Heinsfeld, A. S.,
- 975 Adebimpe, A., Vogelstein, J. T., Yan, C.-G., Esteban, O., Poldrack, R. A., Craddock, C.,
- 976 Fair, D., Satterthwaite, T., Kiar, G., & Milham, M. P. (2021). *Moving Beyond Processing*

977

and Analysis-Related Variation in Neuroscience (p. 2021.12.01.470790).

978 https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.01.470790

- 279 Linden-Carmichael, A. N., Stamates, A. L., & Lau-Barraco, C. (2019). Simultaneous Use of
- 980 Alcohol and Marijuana: Patterns and Individual Differences. *Substance Use & Misuse*,

981 54(13), 2156–2166. https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2019.1638407

- 982 Lydon-Staley, D. M., & Bassett, D. S. (2018). The Promise and Challenges of Intensive
- 983 Longitudinal Designs for Imbalance Models of Adolescent Substance Use. *Frontiers in* 984 *Psychology*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01576
- 985 Marek, S., Hwang, K., Foran, W., Hallquist, M. N., & Luna, B. (2015). The Contribution of
- 986 Network Organization and Integration to the Development of Cognitive Control. *PLoS*987 *Biology*, 13(12), e1002328. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002328
- 988 McLaren, D. G., Ries, M. L., Xu, G., & Johnson, S. C. (2012). A generalized form of context-
- 989 dependent psychophysiological interactions (gPPI): A comparison to standard
 990 approaches. *NeuroImage*, *61*(4), 1277–1286.
- 991 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.03.068
- Meisel, S. N., Fosco, W. D., Hawk, L. W., & Colder, C. R. (2019). Mind the gap: A review and
 recommendations for statistically evaluating Dual Systems models of adolescent risk
- 994 behavior. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *39*, 100681.
- 995 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2019.100681
- Michaelsen, M. M., & Esch, T. (2021). Motivation and reward mechanisms in health behavior
 change processes. *Brain Research*, *1757*, 147309.

998 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2021.147309

- Mumford, J. A., & Ramsey, J. D. (2014). Bayesian networks for fMRI: A primer. *NeuroImage*, *86*,
 573–582. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.10.020
- 1001 Munn, B. R., Müller, E. J., Wainstein, G., & Shine, J. M. (2021). The ascending arousal system
- 1002 shapes neural dynamics to mediate awareness of cognitive states. *Nature*
- 1003 *Communications*, *12*(1), 6016. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-26268-x
- 1004 Murray, L., Lopez-Duran, N. L., Mitchell, C., Monk, C. S., & Hyde, L. W. (2020). Neural
- 1005 Mechanisms of Reward and Loss Processing in a Low-Income Sample of At-Risk

1006

Adolescents. Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience.

1007 https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsaa157

- 1008 Noble, S., Scheinost, D., & Constable, R. T. (2019). A decade of test-retest reliability of
- 1009 functional connectivity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *NeuroImage*, 203,
- 1010 116157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2019.116157
- Oldham, S., & Fornito, A. (2019). The development of brain network hubs. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *36*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2018.12.005
- Oldham, S., Murawski, C., Fornito, A., Youssef, G., Yücel, M., & Lorenzetti, V. (2018). The
 anticipation and outcome phases of reward and loss processing: A neuroimaging meta-
- analysis of the monetary incentive delay task. *Human Brain Mapping*, *39*(8), 3398–
- 1016 3418. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24184
- 1017 Orman, G. K., & Labatut, V. (2009). A Comparison of Community Detection Algorithms on
- 1018
 Artificial Networks. In J. Gama, V. S. Costa, A. M. Jorge, & P. B. Brazdil (Eds.), Discovery

 1019
 Science (pp. 242–256). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04747-3
 20
- 1020 Padoa-Schioppa, C., & Conen, K. E. (2017). Orbitofrontal Cortex: A Neural Circuit for Economic
- 1021
 Decisions. Neuron, 96(4), 736–754. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.09.031
- 1022 Park, H. R. P., Kostandyan, M., Boehler, C. N., & Krebs, R. M. (2018). Smiling faces and cash
- 1023 bonuses: Exploring common affective coding across positive and negative emotional
- and motivational stimuli using fMRI. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience,*
- 1025 *18*(3), 550–563. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-018-0587-3
- Parkes, L., Fulcher, B., Yücel, M., & Fornito, A. (2018). An evaluation of the efficacy, reliability,
 and sensitivity of motion correction strategies for resting-state functional MRI.
- 1028 *NeuroImage*, *171*, 415–436. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2017.12.073
- Pessoa, L. (2017). A Network Model of the Emotional Brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 21(5),
 357–371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.03.002
- 1031 Pessoa, L. (2021). Complex Systems: The Science of Interacting Parts. OSF Preprints.
- 1032 https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/635tq
- Pinti, P., Scholkmann, F., Hamilton, A., Burgess, P., & Tachtsidis, I. (2019). Current Status and
 Issues Regarding Pre-processing of fNIRS Neuroimaging Data: An Investigation of

- 1035Diverse Signal Filtering Methods Within a General Linear Model Framework. Frontiers1036in Human Neuroscience, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2018.00505
- 1037 Plichta, M. M., Schwarz, A. J., Grimm, O., Morgen, K., Mier, D., Haddad, L., Gerdes, A. B. M.,
- 1038 Sauer, C., Tost, H., Esslinger, C., Colman, P., Wilson, F., Kirsch, P., & Meyer-Lindenberg,
- 1039 A. (2012). Test–retest reliability of evoked BOLD signals from a cognitive–emotive fMRI
- 1040 test battery. *NeuroImage*, *60*(3), 1746–1758.
- 1041 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.01.129
- Pons, P., & Latapy, M. (2005). Computing Communities in Large Networks Using Random
 Walks. In pInar Yolum, T. Güngör, F. Gürgen, & C. Özturan (Eds.), *Computer and*
- 1044 Information Sciences—ISCIS 2005 (pp. 284–293). Springer.
- 1045 https://doi.org/10.1007/11569596_31
- 1046 Posner, J., Russell, J. A., & Peterson, B. S. (2005). The circumplex model of affect: An
- 1047 integrative approach to affective neuroscience, cognitive development, and
- 1048 psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, *17*(3), 715–734.
- 1049 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579405050340
- 1050 Power, J. D., Mitra, A., Laumann, T. O., Snyder, A. Z., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S. E. (2014).
- 1051 Methods to detect, characterize, and remove motion artifact in resting state fMRI.
- 1052 *NeuroImage*, *84*, 320–341. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.08.048
- 1053 Price, R. B., Beltz, A. M., Woody, M. L., Cummings, L., Gilchrist, D., & Siegle, G. J. (2020). Neural
- 1054 Connectivity Subtypes Predict Discrete Attentional-Bias Profiles Among Heterogeneous
- 1055 Anxiety Patients. *Clinical Psychological Science*, *8*(3), 491–505.
- 1056 https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702620906149
- 1057 R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* R Foundation
 1058 for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/
- 1059 Ram, N., & Grimm, K. J. (2009). Growth Mixture Modeling: A Method for Identifying
- 1060 Differences in Longitudinal Change Among Unobserved Groups. *International Journal of*
- 1061 *Behavioral Development*, *33*(6), 565–576. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025409343765

1062 Rolls, E. T. (2014). Emotion and decision-making explained: A précis. *Cortex; a Journal Devoted*

1063 to the Study of the Nervous System and Behavior, 59, 185–193.

1064 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.01.020

- Romer, D. (2010). Adolescent Risk Taking, Impulsivity, and Brain Development: Implications for
 Prevention. *Developmental Psychobiology*, *52*(3), 263–276.
- 1067 https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.20442
- 1068 Roy, M., Shohamy, D., & Wager, T. D. (2012). Ventromedial prefrontal-subcortical systems and 1069 the generation of affective meaning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *16*(3), 147–156.
- 1070 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2012.01.005
- 1071 Rubin, D. B. (1976). Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3), 581–592.
- 1072 https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/63.3.581
- 1073 Rubin, M. (2021). When to adjust alpha during multiple testing: A consideration of disjunction,
- 1074 conjunction, and individual testing. *Synthese*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-021-1075 03276-4
- Sherman, L., Steinberg, L., & Chein, J. (2018). Connecting brain responsivity and real-world risk
 taking: Strengths and limitations of current methodological approaches. *Developmental*
- 1078 *Cognitive Neuroscience*, *33*, 27–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2017.05.007
- 1079 Shulman, E. P., Smith, A. R., Silva, K., Icenogle, G., Duell, N., Chein, J., & Steinberg, L. (2016).
- 1080The dual systems model: Review, reappraisal, and reaffirmation. Developmental1081Cognitive Neuroscience. 17. 103–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/i.dcn.2015.12.010
- 1081
 Cognitive Neuroscience, 17, 103–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2015.12.010
- 1082 Siegel, J. S., Power, J. D., Dubis, J. W., Vogel, A. C., Church, J. A., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S.
- 1083 E. (2014). Statistical improvements in functional magnetic resonance imaging analyses 1084 produced by censoring high-motion data points. *Human Brain Mapping*, *35*(5), 1981–
- 1085 1996. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22307
- 1086 Silverman, M. H., Jedd, K., & Luciana, M. (2015). Neural networks involved in adolescent
- 1087 reward processing: An activation likelihood estimation meta-analysis of functional
- 1088 neuroimaging studies. *NeuroImage*, *122*, 427–439.
- 1089 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.07.083

- 1090 Smith, S. M. (2002). Fast robust automated brain extraction. *Human Brain Mapping*, *17*(3),
- 1091 143–155. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.10062
- 1092 Smith, S. M., Miller, K. L., Salimi-Khorshidi, G., Webster, M., Beckmann, C. F., Nichols, T. E.,
- 1093 Ramsey, J. D., & Woolrich, M. W. (2011). Network modelling methods for FMRI.
- 1094 *NeuroImage*, 54(2), 875–891. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.08.063
- 1095 Soares, J. M., Magalhães, R., Moreira, P. S., Sousa, A., Ganz, E., Sampaio, A., Alves, V., Marques,
- 1096 P., & Sousa, N. (2016). A Hitchhiker's Guide to Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging.
- 1097 *Frontiers in Neuroscience, 10,* 515. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2016.00515
- 1098 Steegen, S., Tuerlinckx, F., Gelman, A., & Vanpaemel, W. (2016). Increasing Transparency
- 1099 Through a Multiverse Analysis: *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.
- 1100 https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616658637
- 1101 Steinberg, L. (2008). A Social Neuroscience Perspective on Adolescent Risk-Taking.
- 1102 Developmental Review: DR, 28(1), 78–106. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2007.08.002
- 1103 Steinberg, L. (2010). A dual systems model of adolescent risk-taking. Developmental
- 1104 Psychobiology, 52(3), 216–224. https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.20445
- 1105 Szczepanski, S. M., & Knight, R. T. (2014). Insights into human behavior from lesions to the
- 1106 prefrontal cortex. *Neuron*, *83*(5), 1002–1018.
- 1107 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.08.011
- 1108 Szucs, D., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2017). Empirical assessment of published effect sizes and power
- in the recent cognitive neuroscience and psychology literature. *PLOS Biology*, 15(3),
- 1110 e2000797. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2000797
- 1111 Szucs, D., & Ioannidis, J. PA. (2020). Sample size evolution in neuroimaging research: An
- 1112 evaluation of highly-cited studies (1990–2012) and of latest practices (2017–2018) in
- 1113 high-impact journals. *NeuroImage*, 221, 117164.
- 1114 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117164
- 1115 Thompson, W. H., Wright, J., & Bissett, P. G. (2020). Open exploration. *ELife*, 9, e52157.
- 1116 https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.52157

Wan, Z., Rolls, E. T., Cheng, W., & Feng, J. (2020). Sensation-seeking is related to functional
 connectivities of the medial orbitofrontal cortex with the anterior cingulate cortex.

1119 *NeuroImage*, 116845. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116845

1120 Weigard, A., Beltz, A., Reddy, S. N., & Wilson, S. J. (2018). Characterizing the role of the

1121 pre-SMA in the control of speed/accuracy trade-off with directed functional

1122 connectivity mapping and multiple solution reduction. *Human Brain Mapping*, 40(6),

1123 1829–1843. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.24493

Weiland, B. J., Welsh, R. C., Yau, W.-Y. W., Zucker, R. A., Zubieta, J.-K., & Heitzeg, M. M. (2013).
 Accumbens functional connectivity during reward mediates sensation-seeking and

alcohol use in high-risk youth. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *128*(1), 130–139.

1127 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2012.08.019

1128 Willoughby, T., Good, M., Adachi, P. J. C., Hamza, C., & Tavernier, R. (2013). Examining the link

1129 between adolescent brain development and risk taking from a social-developmental

1130 perspective. *Brain and Cognition*, *83*(3), 315–323.

1131 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2013.09.008

Autho

1132 Zuckerman, M. S., Eysenck, S. B. G., & Eysenck, H. J. (1978). Sensation seeking in England and

1133 America: Cross-cultural, age, and sex comparisons. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*

1134 *Psychology*, *46*(1), 139–149. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.46.1.139

1135

jnr_25005_f1-4.docx

















