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# Abstract

**Background:**We learn the value of states and actions in a specific structured environment through rewards and punishments. Different kinds of punishment were used in behavioral research but not yet probed by themselves in a long, phone-home based, longitudinal study.

**Methods:**Here we examine two essentially different punishments: Monetary Loss and Loud White Noise. To distinguish between them subjects performed regularly, morning and evening, a trial-and-error choice task and their psychological and behavioral responses were collected for 12 days. Subjects were assigned randomly to one of the two types of punishment and played the tasks in a novel mobile-phone platform that was installed in their phone and therefore was conducted in their own familiar environment outside the lab.

**Results:** We found a high accuracy rates in training and in testing for both groups. Additionally, subjects maintained a good recall of stimuli value for a long time after they learned them. A heartrate analysis showed a ….

**Conclusions:**Subjects learned and remembered well stimuli values throughout the 12 days of the study in both types of punishment. The mobile platform we used is valid for studying the mechanisms of aversive learning in a longitudinal experiment.

**Keywords:** Reinforcement learning, Loud white Noise, Monetary loss.
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# Introduction

Operant instrumental learning is used for an interactive understanding of states and actions in the environment. The agent learns associations between behavior and its consequences (Franzoi, S. L. 2015). For an interactive/operative understanding of our environment we use operant instrumental conditioning to establish a state-action-outcome connection. As a result, we can obtain more beneficial behaviors in the future. To learn these connections we use reinforcement learning. We act (or observe actions) in different states, see the consequences (reward, punishment or neutral) obtained by those actions and correct our behavior accordingly. Over time, we get a reasonably effective knowledge of our surroundings, therefor we can adapt, habituate, and thrive.

Appetitive or aversive outcomes are used to encourage or inhibit, respectively, a state-action behavior. They are essential components in operant instrumental learning. The interaction between the agent's actions (approach or withdrawal) or inaction (inhibition, ignorance) in a specific state and the outcome obtained molds the value of that state-action over time. [The dynamics of the reinforcement value function is having an expected value (prediction) of the potential gain/loss from a state-action, receiving the outcome, forming a prediction error, and updating the expected value. Following sufficient steps, a steady and "good enough" evaluation of the state-action is expected.

In a way, punishment and reward are "two sides of the same coin" in the process of operant learning. **Nevertheless it is well known that they differ in some important characteristics** (*Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al 2018*). The activation and nonactivation of dopaminergic neurons in the ventral striatum in the brain are classically attributed to reward mechanisms of positive reward prediction error and negative reward prediction error, respectively (*Schultz 2007*), whereas in aversive learning mechanisms the amygdala is more widely implicated (*Eldar et al. 2016a; Toshikazu et al. 2018; Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al 2018*; *Costafreda et al 2008*). For example, Michely et al show that subregions in the basolateral amygdala encodes a punishment prediction error (Michely et al 2020). Furthermore, with respect to neurotransmitters, Dopamine is associated with reward prediction errors whereas Serotonin is implicated in punishment prediction errors (Cools et al 2008).   
Moreover, there is evidence that punishment has a different influence on learning and behavior than reward. Steel et al found that punishment had greater effect on learning in both sequencing skill task (SRTT) and motor skill task (FTT), although the effect on the SRTT task was positive whereas the effect of punishment on the FTT task was negative (Steel et al 2016). Galea et al. found that punishment produced faster learning for motor adaptation whereas reward caused greater retention (Galea et al 2015)**.** Moreover, people are more inclined to choose the no punishment than the matching reward option. This is the view of the canonical prospect theory of *Kahneman & Tversky* named as loss aversion and loss bias (*Kahneman & Tversky 1979)*. In animal research of punishment, Marchant et al found individual differences in the susceptibility to constant shock intensity in alcohol preferring Pack rats. The data showed a bimodal distribution in the response to punishment (*Marchant et al 2018*). However, other studies did not find a significant difference in classical conditioning through reward and punishment (**Delgado et al**).

In the clinical psychiatric perspective, disfunctions in reward or in punishment, result in different kinds of clinical disorders. For example, a dysfunctional reward system (e.g. unstable learning rate) has been linked to depression and bipolar disorder (*Eldar 2016*). I contrast, a dysfunctional punishment system, was linked to anxiety (more precisely, cognitive anxiety; see *Wise & Dolan 2020*). For example, Aylward et al found that anxious participants learned faster from negative outcomes, i.e.- had higher learning rate (*Duits et al 2015; Aylward et al 2019*; although see *Wise & Dolan 2020*). On the other hand, a lower sensitivity to punishment is implicated in addiction and psychopathy (*Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al 2018*).

research in operant conditioning predominantly focused on the processes of appetitive reinforcement. Reward incentivization and its traits, mechanisms and implications are widely probed, and great progress has already been made. Unfortunately, this is not the case for punishment. Although punishment has an important role in learning processes and its great potential implications for psychiatric disorders (*Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al. 2018; Wise & Dolan 2020*), we are still in ignorance with respect to some of its traits, neuronal and computational mechanisms, and its precise influence on human behavior (*Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al. 2018; Wise & Dolan 2020*). Thus, the investigation of punishment is crucial and has a promising, fruitful prospect.

Based on Azrin and Holtz we can define punishment as the delivery of a stimulus that is contingent\* to some behavior and causes a reduction in the likelihood of that behavior occurring again (*Azrin and Holtz 1966*). This famous *Azrin and Holtz* definition emphasizes two important points, the punisher is not necessarily an aversive stimulus and that an aversive stimulus is not always punishment. The main feature a punisher must have is the reduction in the probability of a behavior to occur. If, for example, aversive US is paired with another CS but there is no reduction in the occurrences of the CS, the aversive US is not a punisher. We must see a learning process (e.g. the rat is not eating the cheese anymore to avoid a repugnant taste). The other feature is the contingency of the punisher with a behavior. In other words, the punisher's temporal association with the stimulus drives a reduction in the stimulus attraction and hence reducing its probability to get happen in the future. [There are other phenomena that although look like punishment but are in fact very different, therefor we must not confuse between them (see *Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al 2018 for heuristic* differences between them and punishment).]

Two theories offered to describe the **effect** of punishment on choices. The additive theory and the subtractive theory. The **additive** theory claims that punishment reinforce another stimulus that avoids the punishment, therefor reducing the occurrences of punished stimulus, whereas the **subtractive** theory claims that punishment suppresses the appetitive attraction of a stimulus and thus causing a reduction in the probability of choosing that punished stimulus (Toshikazu et al, 2018). Furthermore, in the subtractive school there is a long dispute about the symmetrical nature of reward and punishment (*Rasmussen and Newland 2008*). *Rasmussen and Newland* concluded that punishment has a greater effect on choices than reward and therefor they are not symmetrical. Interestingly, Palminteri et al show, that over time, in a punishing context, punishment shifts to a reward system of reinforcement. The agent starts associating the non-punishing response with reward and the punishing response with no-reward (Palminteri et al 2015).

## The psychological literature presents a few types of punishers. One distinction is between positive and negative punishment (*Franzoi, S. L. 2015*). A positive punisher is the appearance of an undesirable or aversive stimulus contingently after an operant response. Some examples in research of positive punishers will be the delivery of an air puff, electric shock, and loud noise. Conversely, a negative punisher is the removal of an appetitive stimulus (a reward). Examples in research for negative punishers will be the removal of food and monetary loss (*Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al 2018*). In this context, an interesting question is whether the loss of an existing reward (a negative punisher) is equal to the loss of a potential future reward (Negative RPE)].

## Another distinction in the punishment literature is of primary and secondary aversive stimulus (*Franzoi, S. L. 2015*). The primary punisher is one that the agent instantaneously perceives as aversive and unpleasant without the need for learning or conditioning. Examples of this type are the delivery of an air puff, electric shock, and loud noise that create an immediate repulsion when encountered. Conversely, a secondary punisher is one that needs to be conditioned and learned. For example, a parking ticket, an increase of product price and social punishments like an angry or disapproving face.

*Delgado et al* conducted experiments to probe the effects of monetary loss as a secondary reinforcer and to examine the differences between a primary and secondary punisher in a fear conditioning paradigm. They found that the striatum has an important role in monetary loss punisher (secondary) as in mild shock punisher (primary). Interestingly, the amygdala was activated only in the mild shock condition. They concluded that learning from monetary losses may depend on reinforcement learning mechanisms whereas primary punishers rely more on biological mechanisms. Importantly, they did not find a significant difference between primary and secondary punishment in the acquisition of conditioned responses (*Delgado et al 2011*; *Delgado et al* 2006). In a different study, *Delgado et al* show punishment prediction error signals in the striatum both in primary and secondary punishers. (*Delgado et al* 2008).  
In a different study, *Delgado et al* observed similaritiesin the NRPE signal and monetary loss signal(*Delgado et al 2000*).

Like Electric Shock, Loud White Noise is a common unconditioned stimulus (US) used in punishment conditioning research (Sperl et al 2016). For experiments with many conditioning trials, Sperl et al tried to which of the two US will cause a long and strong Conditioned Stimulus, that will satisfy an EEG and MRI test, and will be strong enough to avoid extinction. They designed a comparison study between them and concluded that Loud White Noise had greater valence of unpleasantness, less extinction of Conditioned Response (CR), and a better recall of the CR after 24h (Sperl 2016). Following Sperl et al we used a Loud White Noise of between 92 DB to 95 DB and considered reducing the volume if the noise was too aversive for participants. It is worth mentioning that other studies, like Muller et al, delivered different volumes and durations of white noise (Muller et al 2014, Moses et al 2007, Dolan et al 2006).

As mentioned above, punishment is considered a complementary side to appetitive reinforcement (*Jean-Richard-Dit-Bressel et al 2018*). ***Conceptually***, they differ in the direction of the probability of choices. While Reward ***increases*** the likelihood of a behavior to occur punishment ***decrease*s** it (*Johnston, J. M. 1972*). This may explain the fact that research of punishment in humans mainly focused on the ways in which punishment suppress appetitive behavior in a monetary context (*Wise & Dolan 2020*). Money is one of the only contexts that punishment can easily and plainly be manipulated and quantitively measured. On each stimulus the potential outcomes are gain or loss (and sometimes also a neutral outcome – no loss/gain). In many studies, punishment was not a single reinforcer but working simultaneously with reward (Steel et al 2016). Another reason for this common paradigm is that experiments want to simulate the frequent environment of learning, an environment that includes punishment vs reward, withdrawal vs approach and repulsion vs attraction. In this kind of design each stimulus has the prospect of delivering reward, punishment and sometimes a neutral feedback. Each stimulus also has different probabilities for each feedback (e.g. Palminteri et al 2015; O'Doherty et al 2001). Another within group paradigm is to designate one session to each reinforcer (Delgado et al). In a between group paradigm researchers designated a group for reward, punishment and added a control group (e.g. Galea et al 2015).

This study differs from those designs as it is testing punishment exclusively in a punishing environment. The only possible outcomes are punishment and the absence of punishment. Hence, there is only punishment prediction error. Importantly, the subject's choice is to avoid the stimulus that has the worse potential outcome by withdrawing their finger from it and as a result, the other (supposedly better) stimulus, is chosen. This design is implementing a scenario in which the agent can only lose, there is nothing to gain by avoiding the bad stimulus except avoiding punishments. It simulates a situation of running away from a threat and choosing the least dangerous choice, therefor all the attention is going to the punisher. As a result of this excluding environment, we wanted to capture solely the effect of punishment and its unique features and see more clearly how punishment affect learning and decision-making. Furthermore, we can test the effects of different kinds of punishments and compare between them (*Delgado et al 2011*). Notably, Delgado et al 2011 design is different from the one we use in our experiment in a few ways. (1) their design is of a fear conditioning task when the subjects simply observe the CS and the US attached to it. (2) their experiment is a within-subject design, meaning each subject had two sessions – one of each punisher.

**Importantly, this experiment has a novel methodology** in that was used in recent years to collect behavioral, physiological, and psychological data to probe the reward reinforcement learning. It is a longitudinal experiment conducted for about 12 days. The experiment is running through a novel mobile platform design and conducted at the natural environment of the subject and not in a laboratory setting. This is a new realistic approach for human studies that hopefully will give us also more realistic data collection.

The aim of this study is to validate that our design is working, and subjects do learn the values of the stimuli throughout the 12 days of the experiment, through punishments. Our target is to track the learning process through the performance in training and testing and eliminate the claim of habituation in both punishment types. These results will also give us a first glimpse about the differences between a positive-primary punisher and a negative-secondary punisher. Finally, we compare aversive instrumental learning results with the data of a parallel experiment on reward instrumental learning conducted in the lab. In addition to the behavioral data, we monitored the heartrate of subjects while doing the tasks. With this, we hope to see physiological differences between punished and non-punished trials and also look for differences between groups. This experiment will hopefully give us good preliminary results that would help in developing similar studies in the future.

## 

# Materials and Methods

This is the “HOW”-section and has the purpose of describing in detail exactly how the research was conducted. The ideal aim should be that another researcher based on the information given in this section should be able to replicate the study. The materials and methods section is normally divided into a number of subsections:

## Participants:

If your study involves a survey or experiment, often the first section contains some minimal demographic information about the participants. How many? Gender distribution? Mean age and standard deviations? Any particular inclusion/exclusion criteria (e.g. only participants speaking languages relying on SVO were included or participants with prior knowledge of Japanese were excluded). If relevant something on informed consent and payment?

[19 healthy volunteers (mean-age: 25.47±3.53; range 20 – 33 years old; 12 female subjects) were recruited through social media advertisements and participated in a 12-day experiment conducted through a trial-and-error game installed on their phones. Seven participants were excluded from the study, Three of them due to technical problems, another three because of insufficient compliance to the schedule of tasks, and one that had repeated bad performance from the beginning of the experiment.]

12 healthy volunteers (mean-age: 25.58±2.96; range 20 – 31 years old; 8 female subjects) were recruited through social media advertisements and participated in a 12-day experiment conducted through a trial-and-error game installed on their phones. Subjects who did not have phones that are compatible with the experiment application were delivered a phone owned by the lab. All subjects underwent a screening process to exclude any motoric, auditory or vision disability. The screening process also excluded any past psychiatric disorder or the use psychiatric medications and drugs. The experiment was approved by the Helsinki committee and subjects signed a consent form accordingly. All subjects were paid by the hour (40 shekels) plus the amount left in the experiment band or a finishing bonus (for elaboration on the paying method see the appendix section).

## Materials/Stimuli

The Learning game contained 64 round fractals with styled backgrounds. Those stimuli were divided into different sets and in each game a one or to sets were presented. Each stimulus within a set had different probability of delivering punishment. Each set had a fixed probabilities, either [0, .33, .66] or [.33, .66, 1].

The games in the preliminary lab meeting consisted of 13 games and overall 388 trials. The games outside the lab consisted of 44 games (within 11 days) of overall 3088 trials. Altogether, each subject had 3476 trials. 2211 of them were training trials (with feedback) and 1265 were testing trials (without feedback).

In each game, one or two sets of stimuli were presented to the subject pairing two stimuli in each trial, and the subject had to remove her finger from the image she thought will most probably deliver punishment.

Punishments were ither the lose of a coin (worth approximately 0.2 shekels) for the monetary loss group or, the delivery of a loud white noise (92-95 Db, duration: 0.5 seconds) for the noise group.

## Procedure

How was the investigation carried out? Outline the procedure you followed in detail. What were the participants supposed to do and when? Outline the full experimental procedure (e.g. “first participants were instructed and given the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the test materials. Then they were engaged in a session consisting of x trials ...” etc.). Also specify which equipment/software/ programming language and packages were used to record responses/mine data/build your model (e.g. “Survey was administered with Surveymonkey and results were transferred to .csv files.” …. “; “Using the facebook graph API, we tracked user comments to 40 public posts over a period of two weeks…”; “I used Python and nltk to analyze the rate of X among A versus B by…”. )

Subjects were assigned randomly into two groups of two types of punishments. Each participant went through a screening interview to suffice the experiment criteria and if successful the subject was invited to the preliminary lab meeting. In this lab meeting, subjects first signed a consent form. Then the experimenter explained them the schedule of the task throughout the days of the experiment. The schedule of the app starts in the morning and when the subject wakes up she needs to press a "woke up" button in the app and report the quality of her sleep and the content of her dreams if she can recall. Also the subject needed to play two games of the task in the morning and in the evening and to fill three mood questionnaires throughout the day. Before going to sleep, a video recording task was delivered in which the subject needed to tell about her day within 20 seconds and following that, pressing a "went to sleep" button when she is ready to go to sleep. This routine was kept for 10 Consecutive days, following by a rest day and finally another experiment day meant as a summery test for all stimuli.

For the **monetary-loss group**, we conducted a preliminary task beforehand to create an experiment bank from which the subject can lose money. This task is somewhat similar to other monetary loss studies (such as *Delgado et al 2011*; Steel et al 2016; Steel et al 2020) although our task was unique. The task included spinning a Wheel of fortune (in a computer program) with different amounts of gains (400-1000 shekels). Unknown to the participants, the amount of money they won was fixed on 600 shekels (eq to ~182 dollars) in order to equalize the amount of money for all subjects. This was their bank of money from which they can lose and therefore should do their best to avoid punishments. The aim of this task was to magnify the effect of money loss on subjects by creating a sense of endowment to make the subject value more the initial sum of money. We also wanted to create a sense of agency, to increase the engagement and interest of subjects (Taub et al. 2020). The reason for doing that is our fear that since the amount being reduced in each loss of a coin is meager (0.2 shekels, ~ 0.06 dollars) we might lose the loss aversion effect and the motivation to avoid punishments might be sparse too. Although we have many trials along the experiment, and therefor the potential amount of loss is great, still, participant might not look on the big picture and therefor disregard the micro loss in a single trial. The sense of endowment and agency over the money increases the aversiveness of the monetary loss, therefore magnifying the effect on the subject (*Delgado et al 2011*; *Tricomi et al., 2004; Zink et al., 2004;* *De Martino et al., 2009*).

**The loud white noise group** was supplied with earphones from the lab (Miracase MBTO106). To make sure that subjects are wearing the earphones and listening to the delivery of punishments, we added a task of colors between trials. Randomly, every few trials appeared a screen with six rectangles of different colors. Then, one of the color names randomly asserted, sometimes to the left ear and sometimes to the right ear, and the subject needed to press the matching colored-rectangle. Also, in testing sessions, when a set of punishments was delivered, the task appeared randomly between noises.

Afterwards, for both groups, the experimenter downloaded and installed the application of the experiment on the subject's phone (or, if it was not compatible, the phone was delivered by the lab – "Redmi Note 9 Pro").

For the White Noise group, a sound calibration was made beforehand to set the Db volume in the range determined in the experiment plan. To check the sound volume we used a sound meter monitor "UT353 Mini Sound Level Meter". As in Sperl et al study, the range was between 92-95 Db for every subject in the noise group (mean Db=92.68±0.69; range 92 – 93.6 Db). The variability in the Db volume is due to the different phone systems and from the amount of intensity of the noise perceived by each subject. If the noise was unbearably intense for the subject, we lower the volume but maintained a minimum threshold of 92 Dbs.

After that, we instructed the subject how to put the wearable sensors on her body. Two physiological sensors were used to collect body data: a "Muse EEG sensor" device to measure brain activity and a " Polar H10 " device monitor to measure heartbeat rates:

A person and person in swimsuits on a beach

Description automatically generated with low confidence A person wearing glasses

Description automatically generated with low confidence

Subjects had to wear the sensors whenever they played the experiment game and it included a rest state measure of five minutes before starting the games.

Next, we explained the tasks to the subjects in details, including the structure of the game.

**THE GAME:**

The game itself is a trial-and-error learning game in which subjects need to choose between 2 stimuli every time. Each stimulus has its own probability to deliver punishment. Unknown to the subjects, the probabilities were set to be in a hierarchical structure with the probabilities of [0, .33, .66] or [.33, .66, 1] where 0 represents no chance of getting punished and 1 means that punishment will be delivered 100% of the times.

Notably, subjects started each trial by pressing on both the right-side stimulus and left-side stimulus and the way of choosing is by lifting the finger pressing the unwanted stimulus and as a result the other one is chosen.

After they choose, subjects can see the outcome of their choice and learn the value of that stimulus. A punishment outcome was seen as a red arrow pointing down inside a circle with black background (and in the noise group was paired with a loud white noise) and no punishment outcome was seen as a blank black circle .It was emphasized to the that the game is probabilistic and therefore a bad stimulus can sometimes not deliver punishment (although it is still the worst choice) and a not bad stimulus can sometimes deliver punishment (although it is still the best choice).

A picture containing shape

Description automatically generated

After enough times that a set of stimuli was repeated, a curtain covered the outcomes to conceal them from the subject. This means that the training phase is over, and the **testing** phase starts for that certain set of stimuli. This way we can see how much is learned throughout the trials of those stimuli and test for their recall. Nevertheless, the outcomes of choices were stored, and punishments are presented as a message to the subject after every 10 trials saying that she lost X number of coins in the last 10 trials, in the money loss group, and in the white noise group saying that she was punished X times in last 10 trials. In addition to the message, in the white noise group, a loud white noise was delivered the number of times that the hidden outcomes conveyed punishments. This way we kept the subjects motivated without revealing the outcomes and therefore continuing the learning phase.

## Analysis

Outline procedures for any type of preprocessing of the data such as transcriptions or coding (what was the coding scheme? Was any data excluded and if so on what grounds? Were any means taken in order to secure reliability?). Optionally, here you can also specify which statistical test you used and the software tools. If your study did not involve a lot of data processing (if you recorded data that can be more or less directly fed into statistical analysis) this section can be collapsed with the result section rather than constitute a separate section.

# Results

WHAT did you find? Here you present the output of your statistical analyses. This is often a pretty short section with mostly numbers (means, standard deviations and optionally inferential stats such as e.g. t-values and p-values). The results should preferably be accompanied with figures presenting tables or possibly graphs such as scatter plots or bar diagrams illustrating the results visually. Notice that this section is not the place for lengthy descriptions and interpretations of your results – that should go to the Discussion-section.

Table 1: Interesting results.

| Condition | Means/sd |
| --- | --- |
| xxxx | 63% ± 12% |
| yyyy | 96% ± 23% |
| zzzz | 70% ± 8% |
| wwww | 22% ± 9% |

fig4_StructIconExp2

Figure 1: This is a figure.

# Discussion

**This study is using a novel design** in which subjects played a trial-and-error game on a mobile platform for 12 days Outside of the laboratory at their natural environment.

**The results show** that subjects of both groups learned stimuli values throughout the 12 days of the experiment…habituation…motivation…

**Also** from the heartrate data that we collected when subjects played the game, we can see….

**This study has a small sample size** and therefore will not enable us to make conclusions about the differences between groups. However…

**The between-subjects design** is different from other human studies about punishments. This design gives a cleaner effect to the US punisher, as we avoid the confounds that a within design might obtain (Charness et al 2012). Importantly, we used a different primary punisher (Loud White Noise) than *Delgado et al 2011* (Mild shock) that showed more efficacy in the Sperl et al study (2018).

Our target was to make the task **similar to the environment of punishment** and therefore the method of choosing was by avoidance. To do that we made participants withdraw from the stimulus they did not wanted and only by that the paired stimulus was chosen. This method choosing by withdraw was also used in Huys et al (2011).

**Limitations and confounds** of the study.

**Similar future studies should** explore more conclusively the differences between a primary-positive and a secondary-negative punishers and compare them to the mechanisms of reward reinforcers.

**Conclusions**

Implications and applications (as well as limitations) of your work. It can also contain subsections.
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# Footnotes

\**Azrin and Holtz* uses the phrase ***immediate***. we used the word ***contingent*** because, though weaker, a punisher may also be delayed and still reduce the likelihood of the preceding behavior. Additionally if we explain the delay to the subject there is an increase in probability reduction (*Trenholme & Baron, 1975*)