A total of N = 18 electrodes recorded from N = 11 subjects (n = 7 contributed bilateral recordings). Each electrode contributed to a saline and a drug recording session i.e. balanced data.

Data processing:

* Pre and post session DA to unexpected rewards analyzed to find evidence of DA sensitivity for each electrode. An electrode was included if DA was observed contingent upon reward delivery and a cyclic voltammogram from this period had an R2 > .75 with a DA template.
* Session data were then sorted into trials spanning the 5s before, and the 10s after reward delivery.
* Background subtracted 0.5s from reward delivery.
* Data filtered with a 2000 Hz Butterworth filter.
* Chemometric analysis was then performed on these data: A principal components regression was conducted on the data using a standardized training set with a range of DA and pH examples.
* Trials where then excluded if the chemometric model did not fit either 10% of the data, or 5% of consecutive data points in the trial.
* The predicted DA from these trials were then averaged within each session for each reward magnitude.
* The average signal for each reward magnitude was then smoothed with a 0.5s moving average.
* This smoothed data was then plotted (average traces) and analyzed for three measures of DA kinetics in the period between reward delivery and 5s post reward delivery.
  + Area under the curve (AUC; arbitrary units), a proxy of total DA release and reuptake, was measured by integration of the signal (trapezoidal method used, MATLAB trapz() function).
  + Peak DA release (in nA) was measured by finding the highest point in the signal (MATLAB max() function).
  + Latency to peak (in seconds) was defined as the time from reward delivery to peak DA release.

A repeated measures ANOVA with factors of Drug(Saline, LY354740) and Reward Size (Small, Medium, Large) was run on a range of complementary measures of DA release dynamics within the first 5s post reward delivery: Area under the curve (arbitrary units), peak DA release (nA), and latency to peak (s).

Family wise error control for multiple comparisons: Sidak adjusted critical *p*-values for K = 3 comparisons, significant if *p* < .017

**AUC**

Drug *F*(1,17) = 10.52, *p* = .005

Reward Size *F*(2,34) = 32.94, *p* < .001

Drug\*Reward Size *F*(2,34) = 6.88, *p* = .003

***Simple effects of Reward Size:***

Small vs Medium *F*(1,12) = 5.02, *p* = .039

Small vs Large *F*(1,12) = 42.03, *p* < .001

Medium vs Large *F*(1,12) = 51.29, *p* < .001

***Simple effects of Drug (Saline vs LY354740) at each level of Reward Size:***

Small *F*(1,15) = 5.62, *p* = .030

Medium *F*(1,15) = 8.66, *p* = .009

Large *F*(1,15) = 12.18, *p* = .003

**Peak**

Drug *F*(1,17) = 9.77, *p* = .006

Reward Size *F*(2,34) = 33.06, *p* < .001

Drug\*Reward Size *F*(2,34) = 2.61, *p* = .09

***Simple effects of Reward Size:***

Small vs Medium *F*(1,12) = 7.76, *p* = .013

Small vs Large *F*(1,12) = 40.36, *p* < .001

Medium vs Large *F*(1,12) = 30.16, *p* < .001

**Latency to peak**

Drug *F*(1,17) = .14, *p* = .72

Reward Size *F*(2,34) = 14.67, *p* < .001

Drug\*Reward Size *F*(2,34) = 0.15, *p* = .87

***Simple effects of Reward Size:***

Small vs Medium *F*(1,12) = 1.93, *p* = .182

Small vs Large *F*(1,12) = 18.61, *p* < .001

Medium vs Large *F*(1,12) = 16.63, *p* = .001

**Behaviour – Magazine Frequency (paired t-test)**

*t*(10) = 0.37, *p* = .721