

How prior preferences determine decision-making frames and biases in the human brain

Motivation, Brain and Behavior lab, Paris , France
Inserm U1127, CNRS U 7225, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris , France
Institut du Cerveau et de la Moelle épinière, Paris , France

DOI

[10.7554/eLife.20317](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.20317)

Published

Subject Areas

Keywords

Copyright

© 2016 Lopez-Persem et al

Licence

This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) permitting unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Cite this article

. () How prior preferences determine decision-making frames and biases in the human brain. eLife 5 :e20317

<https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.20317>

Abstract

Understanding how option values are compared when making a choice is a key objective for decision neuroscience. In natural situations, agents may have a priori on their preferences that create default policies and shape the neural comparison process. We asked participants to make choices between items belonging to different categories (e.g., jazz vs. rock music). Behavioral data confirmed that items taken from the preferred category were chosen more often and more rapidly, which qualified them as default options. fMRI data showed that baseline activity in classical brain valuation regions, such as the ventromedial Prefrontal Cortex (vmPFC), reflected the strength of prior preferences. In addition, evoked activity in the same regions scaled with the default option value, irrespective of the eventual choice. We therefore suggest that in the brain valuation system, choices are framed as comparisons between default and alternative options, which might save some resource but induce a decision bias.

Additional information

Competing interest

The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

Ethics

Human subjects: The study was approved by the Pitie-Salpetriere Hospital ethics committee (protocole C12-69). All subjects were recruited via e-mail within an academic database and gave informed consent to participate and consent to publish before participation in the study.

Funding

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and interpretation, or the decision to submit the work for publication.

[Download](#)