CORTEX 90 (2017) 149–162

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/cortex

The role of dopamine in positive and negative prediction error utilization during incidental learning – Insights from Positron Emission Tomography, Parkinson's disease and Huntington's disease

David Mathar [a,b,*], *Leonora Wilkinson* [c], *Anna K. Holl* [d], *Jane Neumann* [a,b], *Lorenz Deserno* [a,e,f], *Arno Villringer* [a,b,g,h], *Marjan Jahanshahi* [c,i] *and Annette Horstmann* [a,b,*]

[a] *Department of Neurology, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Leipzig, Germany*
[b] *Leipzig University Medical Center, IFB Adiposity Diseases, Leipzig, Germany*
[c] *Behavioral Neurology Unit, National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA*
[d] *Department of Psychiatry, Medical University of Graz, Graz, Austria*
[e] *Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Campus Charité Mitte, Charité—Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany*
[f] *Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, University of Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany*
[g] *Clinic of Cognitive Neurology, University Hospital Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany*
[h] *Mind & Brain Institute, Berlin School of Mind and Brain, Humboldt-University, Berlin, Germany*
[i] *Sobell Department of Motor Neuroscience & Movement Disorders, UCL Institute of Neurology, London, England, UK*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 20 April 2016
Reviewed 14 June 2016
Revised 9 August 2016
Accepted 7 September 2016
Action editor Stefano Cappa
Published online 19 September 2016

Keywords:
Procedural stimulus-response learning
Computational modeling
Dopamine

ABSTRACT

Incidental learning of appropriate stimulus-response associations is crucial for optimal functioning within our complex environment. Positive and negative prediction errors (PEs) serve as neural teaching signals within distinct ('direct'/'indirect') dopaminergic pathways to update associations and optimize subsequent behavior. Using a computational reinforcement learning model, we assessed learning from positive and negative PEs on a probabilistic task (Weather Prediction Task – WPT) in three populations that allow different inferences on the role of dopamine (DA) signals: (1) Healthy volunteers that repeatedly underwent [^{11}C]raclopride Positron Emission Tomography (PET), allowing for assessment of striatal DA release during learning, (2) Parkinson's disease (PD) patients tested both on and off L-DOPA medication, (3) early Huntington's disease (HD) patients, a disease that is associated with hyper-activation of the 'direct' pathway. Our results show that learning from positive and negative feedback on the WPT is intimately linked to different aspects of dopaminergic transmission. In healthy individuals, the difference in

* *Corresponding authors.* Department of Neurology, Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Stephanstraße 1A, Leipzig, Germany.
E-mail addresses: mathar@cbs.mpg.de (D. Mathar), horstmann@cbs.mpg.de (A. Horstmann).
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.09.004

PET
Parkinson's disease
Huntington's disease

[^{11}C]raclopride binding potential (BP) as a measure for striatal DA release was linearly associated with the positive learning rate. Further, asymmetry between baseline DA tone in the left and right ventral striatum was negatively associated with learning from positive PEs. Female patients with early HD exhibited exaggerated learning rates from positive feedback. In contrast, dopaminergic tone predicted learning from negative feedback, as indicated by an inverted u-shaped association observed with baseline [^{11}C]raclopride BP in healthy controls and the difference between PD patients' learning rate on and off dopaminergic medication. Thus, the ability to learn from positive and negative feedback is a sensitive marker for the integrity of dopaminergic signal transmission in the 'direct' and 'indirect' dopaminergic pathways. The present data are interesting beyond clinical context in that imbalances of dopaminergic signaling have not only been observed for neurological and psychiatric conditions but also been proposed for obesity and adolescence.

1. Introduction

Incidental stimulus-response learning heavily relies on striatal functioning (Jahanshahi et al., 2010; Poldrack et al., 2001). Within the striatum, dopamine (DA) transmission is known to play a key role in fostering learning via encoding the difference between expectations and outcomes of our actions (Montague, Dayan, & Sejnowski, 1996; Schultz, 2002; Schultz, Dayan, & Montague, 1997). These prediction error signals (PEs) are utilized to update current beliefs and, importantly, to adapt subsequent behavior. Positive PEs are signaled via a transient increase in firing rate ('burst') and negative PEs are associated with a pause in tonic firing ('dip'). It has been proposed that DA mediates learning from positive as well as negative outcomes (Van Der Schaaf et al., 2014), but via two segregated ('direct'/'indirect') pathways (Frank, 2005; Frank & O'Reilly, 2006; Frank, Scheres, & Sherman, 2007b; Kravitz et al., 2010). Recently, direct experimental evidence has been provided for this model in healthy volunteers (Cox et al., 2015).

In the 'direct pathway', striatal D1 receptor expressing neurons predominantly send inhibitory projections directly to the output nucleus of the basal ganglia, the globus pallidus interna/substantia nigra pars reticulata (GPi/SNr). Postsynaptic D1 receptors are sensitive to bursts in dopaminergic transmission. Thus, correct stimulus-response associations are strengthened via D1-receptor related modulation of synaptic plasticity within the 'direct' pathway subsequent to positive PEs. In the 'indirect pathway' (Gerfen et al., 1990, pp. 1429–1432; Surmeier, Ding, Day, Wang, & Shen, 2007), striatal neurons expressing D2-receptors predominantly send inhibitory projections first to the external segment of the globus pallidus. From there inhibitory projections reach the subthalamic nucleus (STN). The STN then sends excitatory projections back to the GPi/SNr. Postsynaptic D2 receptors are sensitive to detecting transient dips within the tonic DA signal (Day et al., 2006; Goto & Grace, 2005). Hence, wrong stimulus-response associations are weakened through D2 receptor activity in the 'indirect' pathway subsequent to negative PEs (Jocham et al., 2009, 2014; Klein et al., 2007). Importantly, too low tonic DA may impair D2 receptor-related signaling, as the magnitude of extracellular tonic DA determines the background stimulation of DA receptors (Grace, 1991). In addition, too high tonic DA release may impede D2 receptor-related signaling, as high tonic DA levels can inhibit the phasic DA response via action on presynaptic D2 auto-receptors (Goto, Otani, & Grace, 2007) or via hyperpolarization of dopaminergic neurons (Dyakonova, Chistopolsky, Dyakonova, Vorontsov, & Sakharov, 2009). Thus, either too low or too high tonic DA levels may specifically impede the capability of detecting dips and, consequently, may alter learning from negative PEs in particular. Further, recent data indicate that the hemispheric asymmetry of DA signals is related to the propensity to learn from positive versus negative PEs (Aberg, Doell, & Schwartz, 2015; Maril, Hassin-Baer, Cohen, & Tomer, 2013; Tomer et al., 2014). A mechanistic explanation for this phenomenon is missing to date.

Consequently, it is important to differentiate between learning from positive and negative feedback to identify the specific involvement of different DA pathways or aspects of DA transmission. Further, an investigation of different aspects of DA transmission based on behavior on the same behavioral task will be beneficial for interpretation of the results.

Here, we assessed learning in response to positive and negative PEs in three populations that allow different inferences on the role of DA in incidental stimulus-response learning. Importantly, all participants completed the same probabilistic learning task, the Weather Prediction Task (WPT, Knowlton, Squire, & Gluck, 1994). To differentiate between learning from positive and negative PEs, we employed a computational reinforcement learning model.

First, we explored the influence of dopaminergic signaling in a sample of healthy volunteers who repeatedly underwent [^{11}C]raclopride Positron Emission Tomography (PET) while completing the WPT with and without corrective feedback. Specifically, we investigated the impact of DA release, tonic DA level, and the asymmetry of phasic responses between left and right striatum on learning from positive and negative feedback. We hypothesized that the strength of phasic striatal DA transmission during procedural learning is linearly related to the participants' capability of learning from positive PEs. Further, we predicted that tonic DA levels within the striatum are associated with the ability to learn from negative PEs in an inverted u-shaped manner. Finally, we expected that asymmetry between left and right striatal signaling is related to learning from positive PEs.

Second, we investigated the effect of L-DOPA medication on learning from negative PEs in a sample of patients with Parkinson's disease (PD) who were tested both *on* or *off* medication when completing the WPT. Evidence (e.g., Agid et al., 1993; Kish, Shannak, & Hornykiewicz, 1988) suggests that in early PD DA depletion is mainly limited to dorsal striatum and the ventral striatum is relatively less affected. We expected patients *on* levodopa medication to be selectively impaired in learning from negative PEs compared to *off* medication due to an nonspecific increase in dopaminergic tone in the ventral striatum in the *on* state (Cools, Altamirano, & D'Esposito, 2006; Frank, Samanta, Moustafa, & Sherman, 2007a).

Third, we investigated learning in a sample of early Huntington's disease (HD) patients, a disease that is associated with a hyper-activation of the 'direct' pathway. Thus, we hypothesized that these patients will be selectively impaired in successful learning from positive PEs.

2. Methods

2.1. General methods

2.1.1. WPT

All three studies (PET, PD & HD) involved the same stimulus-response learning task, a standard version of the WPT (Knowlton et al., 1994; see Figure 1 in Wilkinson et al., 2014), with corrective feedback to ensure learning based on striatal DA transmission. In the PET study, participants also completed a control version of the WPT without corrective feedback. Further, the card patterns in the control task were not related to the outcome.

On each trial, participants were presented with a particular arrangement of cards comprising one, two or three of the four possible tarot cards. Participants were asked to decide whether the presented set of cards predicted sunshine or rain. There were 14 possible arrangements of cards, as the four card and no card patterns were not used. The four cards were assigned with a probability for predicting sunshine of 80%, 60%, 40% and 20%, respectively, and predicting rain otherwise. Prediction probabilities for the presented arrangements of cards were derived from the joint probability distribution of the individual cards they contained (see Table 2 in Wilkinson et al., 2014).

After presentation of the stimuli during each trial, participants were asked to predict the weather on that trial, which required them to classify the card arrangement into one of the two possible outcomes (e.g., rainy/fine). Responses were made either via two response buttons (PET/PD study) or verbally to the experimenter (HD study). Following their response, feedback appeared on the screen depending on whether the response was correct (thumbs up) or incorrect (thumbs down). The feedback and the card arrangement both remained on the screen for a short period. After they disappeared a blank screen preceded the presentation of the next combination of cards. If participants failed to make a response, the card arrangement appeared on the screen for the same duration but no feedback was provided. For more details on the particular task designs used in the respective studies please see the original publications (Jahanshahi et al., 2010 [PD study]; Holl, Wilkinson, Tabrizi, Painold, & Jahanshahi, 2012 [HD study]; Wilkinson et al., 2014 [PET study]).

2.1.2. Computational model

Performance on the WPT relies on updating of outcome predictions and related adaptation of subsequent response behavior. Thus, the task was previously used to assess PE-related learning (Rodriguez, Aron, & Poldrack, 2006). As the aim of our study was to assess differential learning from positive and negative feedback, from a conceptual point of view, our computational model needs to fulfill two criteria: (1) The model incorporates two learning rates, separating learning from positive and negative feedback, and (2) the two learning rates need to be interpretable independently from other model parameters. Consequently, we used a slightly modified version of the classical Q-learning model (Frank et al., 2007b) with two separate learning rates that are fitted independently of the choice consistency parameter β (see Eq. (1)). The latter ensures that the learning rates are statistically independent of the choice consistency parameter, which is not the case when fitting is performed simultaneously. In more detail, our reinforcement learning model consists of four input nodes $I_{i=1,\ldots,4}$ with weighted connections to two output nodes (Q-values) $Q_{j=1,2}$ that represent the presence or absence of the four different cues and the two possible outcomes in the WPT, respectively. On each trial, activity of the output nodes is computed as $Q_j = \sum_i q_{ij} I_i$, where q_{ij} is the weight connecting input node I_i and output node Q_j. Weights are initialized to 0 and updated in each trial by means of $q_{ij}(k+1) = q_{ij}(k) + \alpha^{+/-} S_j(R_j - Q_j) I_i$ where R_j encodes the correct output in this trial and S_j represents the subject's response. The latter is included for allowing the model to simulate the behavior of the individual participant rather than optimal learning. To assess learning from positive and negative PEs separately, we fitted two independent learning rates $\alpha^{+/-}$ for $R_j - Q_j \geq 0$ and $R_j - Q_j < 0$, respectively. For each participant the individual learning rates $\alpha^{+/-}$ were determined that minimized the sum of squared differences between the model's output and the participant's response: $\sum_{jk} (S_{jk} - Q_{jk})^2 \rightarrow \min$, with $j = 1, 2$ and k being the number of trials. In a subsequent step, we modeled each participant's choices of a particular outcome to follow a softmax distribution:

$$P(choice = S_j | Q_1, Q_2) = \frac{\exp\left(\beta Q_j\right)}{\exp(\beta Q_1) + \exp(\beta Q_2)} \text{ with } j = 1, 2 \qquad (1)$$

The choice consistency parameter β was fitted to participants' choices by minimizing the negative log likelihood of the choice probabilities P

$$LL = -\ln\left(\prod_k P_k\left(Q_j\right)\right), \qquad (2)$$

while the two learning rates were held constant at the values optimized in the first step. Model fitting and estimation of all parameters was accomplished by nonlinear optimization.

In order to ensure that the modifications to a standard Q-learning model did not compromise adequate model fit, we compared the model described above with (1) a similar model with only one learning rate instead of two and (2) a Q-learning model with simultaneous fitting of all three free parameters.

For quantitative model comparison, we performed random-effects Bayesian model comparison (Daunizeau, Adam, & Rigoux, 2014) to estimate exceedance probabilities and expected model frequencies (Stephan, Penny, Daunizeau, Moran, & Friston, 2009). Additionally, we utilized the Bayesian information criterion $BIC = -2*LL + k*ln(n)$ (Schwarz, 1978), where LL is the log likelihood of the model's choice probabilities, k is the number of free parameters of the respective model and $n = 200$ represents the number of trials. Based on BIC we computed ΔBIC values that represent mean differences (per subject) between the respective model and the model with the lowest BIC value. We also computed pseudo-r^2 values as defined in Daw, Doherty, Dayan, Seymour, and Dolan (2006) to test if our model fitted subjects' learning performance above chance level.

In addition to a quantitative model fit comparison, we assessed if the respective models resembled participants' learning performance in a meaningful way. Therefore, we computed linear regression models with participants' mean percent correct responses as dependent variable and fitted model parameters as independent regressors.

Details of the model comparison are presented in Table 1. Across all subjects, model frequencies and exceedance probabilities favor standard QL which was identified as the best fitting model in 46% of participants. However, BIC values are almost identical for the three models and ΔBIC values of 1.76 and .32 do not provide any strong evidence against the two competing models. In addition, pseudo-r^2 values show that all three models fit similarly above chance level. Within all different study populations, the stepwise 2 LR model provides the best or second best model fit, again with pseudo-r^2 values showing that the model fitted subjects' performance above chance level. Importantly, the stepwise 2 LR model explained significant variance in participants WPT performance in all three studies according to regression analyses. Thus, modifications in our new model yield meaningful and independently interpretable parameter estimates without compromising adequate model fit.

2.1.3. *Statistical analyses*

All behavioral results were computed with PASW-SPSS-Statistics 19.0 (IBM Corporation, Somers, NY, USA). A significance criterion of $\alpha = .05$ was used, unless otherwise specified. All significance levels reported are two-tailed.

2.2. *Methods PET study (Wilkinson et al., 2014)*

2.2.1. *Participants*

Seven (3 female) healthy volunteers in the age of 45–70 ($M = 56.86$, $SD = 8.7$) were recruited. None of the participants

Table 1 – Model comparison between the stepwise modeling approach with two learning rates (stepwise, 2 LR) and two alternatives: a model with only one learning rate and stepwise fitting (stepwise, 1 LR) and a model with two learning rates and simultaneous fitting (standard QL).

		Stepwise, 2 LR	Stepwise, 1 LR	Standard QL
All subjects ($n = 63$)	pseudo-r^2	.37	.37	.38
	BIC	11352	11261	11241
	ΔBIC	1.76	.32	–
	Model frequencies	.27	.26	.46
	Exceedance probabilities	.03	.02	.95
	Regression-model	**$R^2 = .65$**	**$R^2 = .14$**	R^2=.05
		$p < .001$	**$p = .01$**	$p = .4$
PET ($n = 7$)	pseudo-r^2	.25	.25	.23
	BIC	1484	1485	1535
	ΔBIC	–	.14	7.29
	Model frequencies	.45	.44	.11
	Exceedance probabilities (%)	.5	.48	.02
	Regression-model	**$R^2 = .96$**	**$R^2 = .97$**	**$R^2 = .96$**
		$p = .01$	**$p = .001$**	**$p = .02$**
PD ($n = 22$)	pseudo-r^2	.23	.29	.21
	BIC	4677	4460	4953
	ΔBIC	9.86	–	22.41
	Model frequencies	.24	.51	.25
	Exceedance probabilities (%)	.05	.9	.05
	Regression-model	**$R^2 = .91$**	$R^2 = .05$	$R^2 = .11$
		$p = 1.17*10^{-9}$	$p = .63$	$p = .53$
HD ($n = 34$)	pseudo-r^2	.47	.46	.51
	BIC	5192	5315	4752
	ΔBIC	7.02	13.62	–
	Model frequencies	.29	.03	.68
	Exceedance probabilities (%)	.01	0	.99
	Regression-model	**$R^2 = .29$**	$R^2 = .07$	$R^2 = .04$
		$p = .02$	$p = .33$	$p = .76$

N.B. *BIC* = Bayesian Information Criterion. Values in bold indicate significant variance explanation. All three tested models showed comparable model fit according to pseudo-r^2 and *BIC* values. While standard QL shows the best fit according to estimated probabilities and model frequencies across all subjects, ΔBIC indicate no strong evidence against the other two models. Importantly, despite comparable model fit, only the stepwise model with two learning rates was able to explain significant variance in participants' WPT performance in all three studies according to regression analyses. LR = Learning rate.

had any neurological disorder or history of psychiatric illness, drug or alcohol abuse or were on any drug treatments that might influence performance. Participants were asked not to smoke or drink caffeinated drinks for at least 12 h prior to the scan, although we did not control for their average daily consumption of caffeine or nicotine. Participants completed the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI-II) (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961, 1996) to preclude signs of depression. The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Hammersmith, Queen Charlotte's and Chelsea and Acton Hospitals Trust. Permission to administer radioactive substances was granted by the Administration of Radioactive Substances Advisory Committee of the UK. All participants gave written informed consent to take part in this study in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. For more details on selected participants, please see Wilkinson et al. (2014).

2.2.2. WPT

All participants completed 400 trials of the WPT in eight blocks of 50 trials each while having a [^{11}C]raclopride PET scan. For more details, see Wilkinson et al. (2014). Notably, here we analyzed participants' task performance across the first four blocks of 200 trials to assess learning, as afterwards participants' performance reached a plateau.

2.2.3. Control task

As for the WPT, the control task comprised 400 trials (of which we analyzed the first 200) that were completed while participants had a [^{11}C]raclopride PET scan. On each trial participants were presented with an arrangement of between one and three of four possible cards, these were in the same positions on the screen as the card arrangements that were used in the experimental conditions. However, here the patterns on the four cards were identical and were not related to any outcomes or followed by corrective feedback. The card arrangements remained on the screen for a fixed period of 7 sec after which they disappeared and the next card arrangement appeared after 2 sec. Participants were required to press a response button with their right index finger to indicate they had seen the card arrangements.

2.2.4. Scanning procedure

All participants underwent [^{11}C]raclopride PET twice within four weeks. On each scanning session the respective task started 5 min before injection of tracer and ended 5 min before completion of [^{11}C]raclopride PET (total duration 60 min). Half of the participants completed the WPT during the first [^{11}C]raclopride PET session and the remainder did the control task first.

2.2.5. PET scanning

As stated in Wilkinson et al. (2014) PET was performed using an ECAT EXACT HR+ (CTI/Siemens 962, Knoxville, TN) tomograph with a total axial field of 15.5 cm 63 transaxial image planes were displayed as 2.46 mm slices with a reconstructed axial resolution of 5.4 mm and a transaxial resolution of 5.6 mm. A 10-min transmission scan was performed prior to injection of the tracer to correct for tissue attenuation of 511 keV gamma radiation. Dynamic emission scans were acquired in three-dimensional mode. The mean injected doses of [^{11}C]raclopride for each group is listed in Table 1 of Wilkinson et al. (2014). Scanning began at the start of tracer infusion generating 20 periods over 60 min. A laptop was used to present the WPT or control task to the participants, and the tasks commenced 5 min before the injection of RAC. RAC was supplied by Hammersmith Imanet.

2.2.6. Image analysis

As stated in Wilkinson et al. (2014) parametric images of [^{11}C]raclopride binding potential (RAC BP_{ND}) were generated using a basis function implementation of the simplified reference tissue model using cerebellar cortex to estimate non-specific tracer uptake (Gunn, Lammertsma, Hume, & Cunningham, 1997). An image of integrated [^{11}C]raclopride signal from 0 to 60 min (an "ADD" or summed image) was also created for each participant. The ADD images were then spatially normalized to an in-house [^{11}C]raclopride template in standard stereotaxic (MNI) space using statistical parametric mapping (SPM2) software (Wellcome Functional Imaging Laboratory, London). The transformation matrices were then applied to the corresponding [^{11}C]raclopride parametric image. A standard region-of-interest (ROI) object map that outlined putamen, heads of caudate nucleus and ventral striatum was defined on the [^{11}C]raclopride template with magnetic resonance imaging guidance. The ROI object map was then applied to the individual [^{11}C]raclopride parametric images to sample RAC BP_{ND}. The investigator analyzing the scans was blinded to the task associated with each scan.

2.3. Methods PD study (Jahanshahi et al., 2010)

2.3.1. Participants

Eleven individuals with a diagnosis of idiopathic PD (8 male) aged between 53 and 73 ($M = 63.5$, $SD = 6.2$) were included. Patients were recruited from the Movement Disorders Clinics at the National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery. They met Parkinson's Disease Society Brain Bank diagnostic criteria for PD (Hughes, Daniel, Kilford, & Lees, 1992). Disease duration ranged from 3 to 37 years ($M = 13.2$, $SD = 10.7$). Despite the wide range of disease duration, the majority of patients was in the early stage of PD, with disease durations of less than 14 years. Two patients, however, had relatively long disease duration of 30 and 37 years. Without those two patients the average disease duration was 8.76 years. Importantly, the results reported below did not change when the two subjects were excluded from the analyses (or disease duration was included as a covariate). All patients were non-demented as demonstrated by scores >26 on the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) (Folstein, Folstein, & McHugh, 1975) and non-depressed according to scores <18 on the BDI (Beck et al., 1961). The MMSE has been recommended as a screening tool for identifying cognitively impaired patients and, specifically, for characterizing PD associated dementia (e.g., Dubois et al., 2007). All patients were treated with levodopa (Sinemet, Madopar) and were responding well and stable on their medication doses. PD patients were matched with the controls for age, education, sex, verbal IQ and dementia based on MMSE scores. For further details regarding the patient sample please see Jahanshahi et al. (2010).

Further, thirteen healthy volunteers (5 male) aged between 44 and 69 (M = 60.0, SD = 9.7) took part in the study. None of the controls had any neurological disorder, psychiatric illness, head injury, history of alcohol or drug abuse, or depression (BDI). For more details see Jahanshahi et al. (2010).

2.3.2. Task procedure

All participants performed 200 trials of the WPT separated into four blocks of 50 trials each (for more details see e.g., Jahanshahi et al., 2010) twice with different but parallel stimuli and outcomes (rainy/fine or cold/hot) presented on each occasion. Six of the PD patients were tested *off* medication first and the remainder was tested *on* medication first. PD patients completed the off and on medication conditions on 2 separate days, with a mean delay of 11.9 days (SD = 6.9) in between. Controls completed the two assessments on the same day, separated by a long lunch break.

2.4. Methods HD study (Holl et al., 2012)

2.4.1. Participants

Eighteen individuals (9 male) with genetically proven HD [for genetic details, see Table 1 in Holl et al. (2012)] aged between 32 and 68 (M = 50.28, SD = 10.2) took part. Patients were recruited from the HD clinic at the National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery and from the HD clinic at the Department of Psychiatry at Graz Medical University. Patients were in the early stages of the disease, with an average score on the Unified Huntington's Disease Rating Scale Total Functional Capacity (UHDRS TFC, Shoulson & Fahn, 1979) of 11.61 (SD = .3). The UHDRS motor score (Hungtington Study Group, 1996) was used for assessment of motor symptoms, patients presented with an average score of 20.39 (SD = 10.4). All patients were non-demented, as demonstrated by scores >24 on the MMSE. The MMSE has been recommended as a screening tool for identifying cognitively impaired patients (e.g., Dubois et al., 2007). In addition, the patients were screened for clinical depression on the BDI. One patient had a BDI score of 18 and one had a score of 24 (moderate depression), but neither met the criteria for clinical depression in a psychiatric interview.

Eighteen healthy volunteers (9 male) aged between 30 and 74 (M = 50.00, SD = 13.3) took part in the study. Controls were recruited via an advertisement at a local adult education center in London and a participant recruitment website. Prior to participation in the study, controls were interviewed and screened for suitability. None of the controls had any neurological disorder, psychiatric illness, head injury, or history of alcohol or drug abuse. Further screening of the controls was achieved through completion of the MMSE and BDI, on which the controls had mean scores in the normal range.

For further information on the patients and controls sample, please see Holl et al. (2012).

Unfortunately, we had to exclude one healthy participant and one HD patient from modeling analyses, due to partial data loss.

2.4.2. Task procedure

All participants performed 150 feedback-based trials of the WPT separated in three blocks of 50 trials each (for more details see Holl et al., 2012).

3. Results

3.1. Results PET in healthy volunteers

3.1.1. Striatal ^{11}C-raclopride binding

Here, we only report on post-hoc comparisons of RAC BP_{ND} between the WPT and baseline task across ROIs utilizing independent samples *t*-tests. For more details on analyses regarding RAC BP_{ND} data, we refer the reader to Wilkinson et al. (2014).

There was a trend for a reduction in RAC BP_{ND} in the right and left ventral striatum when performing the WPT compared to the control task [13.4% reduction in the right, $t(6) = -2.01$, $p = .09$, 6.0% reduction in the left, $t(6) = -2.18$, $p = .07$], indicating release of synaptic DA during feedback-based stimulus-response learning. This comparison did not trend towards significance for any other region, left putamen ($t(6) = -1.15$, $p = .29$), right putamen and right and left caudate (all ts < 1). For subsequent analyses we use the mean baseline and % change in RAC BP_{ND} of left and right ventral striatum (9.7%).

3.1.2. Behavioral data

As mentioned previously, in the original paper (Wilkinson et al., 2014) WPT mean proportion of correct responses across 8 blocks of 50 trials was analyzed. Here, we only analyzed participants' WPT performance across the first four blocks, as we were interested in the initial learning phase of the task. For this purpose, we utilize a repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) model with within-subjects factor block (4 levels). In addition, to assess the time of emergence and progression of learning across blocks in this condition, mean proportion of correct responses per block was compared to chance (50%) for all four blocks using one sample *t*-tests. Following Bonferroni corrections we adopted a significance threshold of $\alpha = .0125$.

Although the repeated measures ANOVA reported no significant differences between task-blocks [$F(3,6)=1.6$, $p = .23$] on learning performance, there was a trend for a linear association [$F(1,6)=4.47$, $p = .08$], indicating that participants' WPT performance increased across the initial four task-blocks. In line, participants' proportion of correct responses was significantly better than chance from block three onwards: [b1: $t(6)=3.31$; b2: $t(6)=3.08$; b3: $t(6)=3.72$, $p < .01$; b4: $t(6)=3.77$, $p < .01$].

3.1.3. Modeling

As learning the WPT was related to DA transmission within the ventral striatum only, we focus on ventral striatal RAC BP_{ND} in subsequent analyses. We utilized two separate regression models to test our hypotheses regarding the associations of learning from positive and negative PEs with averaged ventral striatal RAC BP_{ND} measures.

The first regression model included positive learning rate as dependent variable and baseline RAC BP_{ND} and % change in RAC BP_{ND} as regressors to test for a positive linear association between positive learning rates and phasic DA transmission. The second model included negative learning rate as dependent variable and baseline RAC BP_{ND} as well as

RAC BP_{ND}^2 as regressors to test for a quadratic (inverted u-shaped) association between height of negative learning rate and tonic DA levels in the ventral striatum. In addition, we computed a regression model with positive learning rate as the dependent variable and ventral striatal dopaminergic asymmetry as a regressor. Asymmetry was assessed by percent difference between left and right baseline RAC BP_{ND}. Finally, we tested a possible quadratic (inverted u-shaped) association between modeled choice consistency and tonic DA release with a model similar to the second one. All regression models included age as a covariate to control for age related effects in DA transmission.

In line with our first hypothesis, learning from positive PEs showed a significant negative linear association with the % change in RAC BP_{ND} within ventral striatum for WPT compared to control task assessment ($R^2 = .89$, $\beta = -.94$, $p = .001$, Fig. 1A), indicating a positive linear association of phasic DA release and learning from positive PEs. Further, modeled negative learning rates showed a significant negative quadratic relationship with the baseline RAC BP_{ND} ($R^2 = .89$, $\beta = -.74$, $p = .005$, Fig. 1B) in ventral striatum. In addition, we observed a significant negative linear relationship between positive learning rate and asymmetry between left and right ventral striatal baseline RAC BP_{ND} ($R^2 = .81$, $\beta = -.9$, $p = .006$, Fig. 1C). Choice consistency was negatively associated with baseline RAC BP_{ND} ($R^2 = .87$, $\beta = -.91$, $p = .006$) in a quadratic model.

3.2. Results PD

3.2.1. Behavioral data

As reported (Jahanshahi et al., 2010) WPT performance (averaged over 200 trials) of healthy controls did not differ significantly across sessions [session 1 (2): .68 (.72), $t(12) = -.99$, $p = .34$]. Therefore, their data were collapsed across assessments to compare PD patients' overall learning performance *on* and *off* medication with the performance of healthy controls. When *off* medication, patients' performance was comparable to the controls' combined performance [$t(35) = -.92$, $p = .36$] indicating that DA levels within ventral striatum were still in an optimal range for learning the WPT. In contrast, when PD patients were tested *on* medication, their overall performance was significantly worse than the controls' combined performance [$t(35) = -2.26$, $p = .03$].

To assess the impact of levodopa on PD patients' performance an repeated measures ANOVA was performed on mean proportion of correct responses with medication (*on vs off*) as a within subjects variable and order of testing (*on* first *vs off* first) as a between groups variable. This analysis revealed a significant main effect of medication [$F(1,9)=11.45$, $p = .01$]. A post-hoc paired sample *T*-test revealed that PD patients showed better WPT performance *off* (.67) than *on* (.63) medication [$t(10)=2.72$, $p = .02$, Fig. 2A]. There was no significant main effect of order [$F(1,9)=1.64$, $p = .23$] or order × medication interaction [$F(1,9)=4.89$, $p = .06$].

3.2.2. Modeling

To test our hypothesis that PD patients *on* medication are specifically impaired in learning from negative PEs we set up a repeated measures ANOVA with within-subjects variable medication (*off/on*). As gender is known to modulate PD onset and phenotype (Haaxma et al., 2007; Van Den Eeden et al., 2003) we included it as a covariate. As there was no effect of order in the behavioral data we did not include this variable. We observed a significant main effect of medication on participants' negative learning rates [$F(1,9)=7.57$, $p = .02$, Fig. 2B]. A similar model yielded no significant effect of medication on positive learning rates [$F(1,9)=.07$, $p = .79$]. There was no significant effect of medication on modeled response consistencies [$F(1,9)=.16$, $p = .23$].

3.3. Results HD

3.3.1. Behavioral data

We utilized a repeated measures ANOVA with within-subjects variable block (1–3) and between-subjects variable group (patients/controls). As the sample size (18) was reasonably large and there is recent evidence of gender-related differences in HD phenotype (Zielonka et al., 2013), we also included gender into our model. The analysis revealed a significant effect of block [$F(2,64)=17.1$, $p < .001$] indicating that, on average, participants learned the task. Learning performance in general was different for healthy controls compared with HD patients as revealed by a significant main effect of group [$F(1,32)=5.64$, $p=.02$]. The between-subject interaction of group × gender was significant [$F(1,32) = 4.9$, $p = .03$, Fig. 3A], showing that learning performance in general was different between gender-specific subgroups. In line, the three-way interaction of block × group × gender exhibited a trend for significance [$F(2,64)=2.87$, $p = .06$], indicating that learning was different between gender specific control and HD groups. All other interactions were non-significant.

In view of the significant gender × group interaction, post-hoc independent samples *t*-tests revealed that female HD patients showed lower over-all learning performance than female control participants [HD = .72, control = .61, $t(16)=3.5$, $p = .003$], whereas there was no difference for men [HD = .7, control = .7, $t(16)=.11$, $p = .92$].

3.3.2. Modeling

We computed two separate ANOVAs for positive and negative learning rates as dependent variables with group and gender as between-subject factors. There was no significant main effect in either model, but the group × gender interaction had a significant impact on participants' positive learning rates [$F(1, 30)=5.15$, $p = .03$, Fig. 3B], whereas there was no such effect on learning rates from negative PEs [$F(1,30)=.15$, $p = .7$]. Post-hoc independent samples *t*-tests revealed that female HD patients showed elevated learning from positive PEs compared to controls [$t(15)=2.13$, $p = .05$]. There was no difference between male patients and control participants [$t(15)=.98$, $p = .34$]. In addition, positive learning rates showed a positive linear association with assessed motor symptom severity across all HD patients [$R^2 = .3$, $\beta=.55$, $p = .02$, Fig. 3C]. Motor symptom severity did not differ significantly between male and female HD patients [$t(15)=.24$, $p = .81$].

There was no significant main effect of group [HD/controls, $F(1,30)=2.14$, $p = .15$] or a group × gender interaction [$F(1,30)=2.78$, $p = .11$] on participants' response consistencies between HD patients and healthy controls.



Fig. 1 – Association between phasic and tonic dopaminergic signaling and learning on the Weather Prediction Task. (A) Dopamine release, as measured by the change in [^{11}C]raclopride binding potential between WPT control and feedback sessions, is positively associated with the ability to learn from positive prediction errors (PEs) in healthy subjects. (B) Dopaminergic tone, as estimated by baseline [^{11}C]raclopride binding potential, is associated with learning from negative PEs in an inverted u-shaped manner. (C) Hemispheric asymmetry between left and right ventral striatum in dopaminergic tone is negatively associated with learning from positive PEs.

4. Discussion

4.1. *Summary*

For optimal functioning within our complex environment procedural learning of appropriate stimulus-response associations is crucial. Positive and negative PEs serve as neural teaching signals within distinct pathways to update these associations and optimize our subsequent behavior. Positive PEs are reflected in an increase in the phasic firing rate of dopaminergic neurons, whereas negative PEs are reflected in transient dips of the tonic DA signal (Schultz et al., 1997; Tobler, Dickinson, & Schultz, 2003). Here, we assessed stimulus-response learning from positive and negative PEs on the probabilistic WPT using computational modeling. We included data from healthy volunteers and from two samples of patients exhibiting specific alterations in predominantly one of the two segregated pathways. Consequently, the different patient populations should reveal disturbances mainly in either learning from positive or learning from negative PEs.

Taken together, our computational modeling results indicate that learning from positive and negative feedback on the WPT is intimately linked to different aspects of dopaminergic transmission. Phasic dopaminergic responses are predictive of learning from positive feedback on the WPT. In healthy individuals, we observed a linear association between difference in RAC BP as a measure for striatal DA release and positive learning rate on the WPT. Further, asymmetry between baseline DA tone in left and right ventral striatum is negatively associated with learning from positive PEs. Female patients with early progression of HD, which is characterized by a hyper-activation of the 'direct' pathway, exhibited exaggerated learning rates from positive feedback. In contrast, dopaminergic tone predicts learning from negative feedback on the WPT, as indicated by an inverted u-shaped association observed with baseline RAC BP in healthy controls and the difference between PD patients *on* and *off* medication.

4.2. *Learning from negative PEs on the WPT*

Dopaminergic tone predicts learning from negative feedback on the WPT, as indicated by an inverted u-shaped association observed with baseline RAC BP in healthy controls. This is in line with previous research showing that avoidance learning was associated in an inverted u-shaped manner with D2 receptor availability (Cox et al., 2015). Importantly, because [^{11}C]-raclopride is competing with endogenous DA, D2 receptor availability as estimated by RAC BP may depend on both, the occupancy of receptors by endogenous DA and D2 receptor density. Thus, baseline BP may in part be interpreted as reflecting dopaminergic tone. It has been shown that either too low or too high tonic DA levels impair behavior in different cognitive domains (Cools & D'Esposito, 2011; Floresco, 2013). Non-optimal DA levels seem to affect particularly the



Fig. 2 – Behavioral differences between *off* and *on* dopaminergic medication in patients with Parkinson's disease on the Weather Prediction Task. (A) Mean proportion correct responses on the Weather Prediction Task for Parkinson patients *off* and *on* dopaminergic medication. (B) Parkinson patients *on* dopaminergic medication are impaired in learning from negative prediction errors on the Weather Prediction Task compared to *off* medication. Asterisk indicates $p < .05$.

capability of detecting dips in tonic dopaminergic signaling and, consequently, may thus alter learning from negative PEs in particular. In healthy volunteers, depletion of DA precursors specifically improves avoidance learning, presumably via a better signal-to-noise ratio due to a reduction of DA tone in the 'indirect' pathway, but leaves approach learning unaffected (Cox et al., 2015). Our results indicate that in PD patients, however, a drastic increase in the level of ventral striatal DA impairs learning from negative PEs. L-DOPA has previously been shown to specifically impair reversal learning (Cools, Barker, Sahakian, & Robbins, 2001) and disrupt activity in the nucleus accumbens in PD patients (Cools, Lewis, Clark, Barker, & Robbins, 2007). Since dopaminergic tone is associated with the ability to learn from negative PEs in an inverted u-shaped manner, our results suggest that ventral striatal dopaminergic tone in PD patients *off* medication is still preserved at an optimal level. This is corroborated by comparable performance of PD patients *off* medication and healthy controls. Additional administration of L-DOPA then causes a suboptimal increase in DA levels in the ventral striatum, resulting in an impaired ability to detect dips in tonic DA. PD patients in our subject sample also received DA agonists besides L-DOPA (see Jahanshahi et al., 2010). Thus, withdrawal from both or even withdrawal from DA agonists alone might have caused the observed differences in PD patients *off* versus *on* medication (Moustafa, Herzallah, & Gluck, 2012, pp. 1–21). However, our results on differences in PD patients' learning from negative PEs between *on* and *off* medication are consistent with earlier reports on the effects of dopaminergic medication on reinforcement learning in PD patients using different tasks (Bodi et al., 2009; Frank et al., 2007a, 2004). In line, Cools et al. (2006) demonstrated a medication-induced deficit that was restricted to conditions with unexpected punishment and Moustafa, Krishna, Eissa, and Hewedi (2013) reported reduced learning from negative feedback in PD patients under dopaminergic medication compared to unmedicated patients. Additionally, Moustafa et al. observed enhanced learning from positive feedback under dopaminergic medication. Notably, they used a simpler probabilistic stimulus-response learning task with only single cue stimuli. Together, these results suggest that dopaminergic tone predicts the ability to learn from negative PEs on the WPT, both in healthy individuals and in PD patients on dopaminergic medication. Importantly, the specific effect depends on the initial level of DA: Because of the basic non-linear relationship between DA levels and performance, additional heightening or lowering levels of DA might cause suboptimal performance on the WPT.

4.3. *Learning from positive PEs on the WPT*

Learning from positive PEs depends linearly on the magnitude of phasic DA release in healthy volunteers. Importantly, dopaminergic tone seems to be a powerful modulator of phasic DA transmission, as learning from positive PEs was best explained when we took into account both, % change in RAC BP as a measure of phasic DA release during learning and baseline RAC BP as an indicator of density and background stimulation of DA receptors. These results are in line with a previous report demonstrating the direct association between learning from positive feedback and signaling in the 'direct' pathway in healthy volunteers (Cox et al., 2015). In their study, learning to approach options associated with a positive outcome in a probabilistic selection task was linearly associated with D1 receptor density in the striatum.

Further, we found the ability to learn from positive PEs to be negatively associated with the asymmetry between baseline DA tone in left and right ventral striatum in healthy volunteers. Our results are in line with previous findings. Gray (1981) postulated that individual differences in motivational behavior are related to either a bias towards behavioral activation to approach incentives or behavioral inhibition to avoid



Fig. 3 – Gender-specific behavioral impairment in patients with Huntington's disease on the Weather Prediction Task. (A) Mean proportion correct responses on the Weather Prediction Task for healthy control subjects and early Huntington Disease (HD) patients split by gender. (B) Interaction between group (control/HD) and gender on the propensity to learn from positive prediction errors on the Weather Prediction Task. (C) Positive learning rate is positively associated with motor symptom severity across both genders in patients with early Huntington's disease.

punishment. Stronger approach motivation has been linked to greater left than right prefrontal activation according to Electroencephalography power (e.g., Sutton & Davidson, 1997), as well as PET and functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging-related activation (Murphy, Nimmo-Smith, & Lawrence, 2003; Wager, Phan, Liberzon, & Taylor, 2003). Presumably, this asymmetric activation is related to hemispheric asymmetry in dopaminergic transmission. Hemispheric asymmetry in DA has repeatedly been shown to be associated with approach and avoidance motivation and learning. In healthy volunteers, self-reported motivational bias between approach and avoidance was predicted by the asymmetry of frontal D2 binding (Tomer et al., 2014). Further, striatal and frontal asymmetries in D2 DA receptor binding predicted individual differences in learning from reward versus punishment (Tomer et al., 2014). PD patients with predominantly left hemispheric deficits were less willing to invest effort to maximize gain, indicating a selective impairment in approach motivation. In contrast, PD patients with a right hemispheric deficit exhibited impairments in avoidance motivation (Porat, Hassin-Baer, Cohen, Markus, & Tomer, 2014). Further, these patients were impaired in learning from positive versus negative feedback, respectively (Maril et al., 2013). In contrast to Aberg et al. (2015), who reported a positive association between better learning from positive PEs and functional asymmetry in left and right ventral striatum, our data indicate a negative relationship. This seeming discrepancy can be explained by the indirect modulation of phasic responses by DA tone via inhibitory actions on the presynaptic cell (Dyakonova et al., 2009; Goto et al., 2007).

So what happens if the balance between the integrity of 'direct' and 'indirect' pathways is compromised? Female patients with early progression of HD, which is characterized by a hyper-activation of the 'direct' pathway, exhibited exaggerated learning rates from positive feedback in our study. In HD, a neurodegenerative, autosomal-dominant transmitted neurodegenerative disorder, cell death of striatal neurons already occurs in early and even pre-symptomatic stages of the disease. The progression of neuronal death in the striatum is gradual and proceeds from dorsal to ventral and from medial to lateral (Aylward et al., 2004; Vonsattel et al., 1985). In early stages of HD, cell death primarily affects GABAergic medium-sized spiny neurons within the 'indirect' pathway. Furthermore, HD has been associated with a loss of pre-synaptic D2 auto-receptors, thus impairing the ability of tonic DA to regulate phasic responses (Cepeda, Murphy, Parent, & Levine, 2014). Reduced striatal D2 receptor availability has been reported even in asymptomatic HD patients and mutation carriers, suggesting that dopaminergic signaling is compromised early in HD (van Oostrom et al., 2009; Weeks, Piccini, Harding, & Brooks, 1996). Taken together, this leads to a hyper-activation of the 'direct' pathway already in very early stages of the disease. In line, HD patients in early stages of the disease have been shown to be generally impaired in procedural stimulus-response learning (Holl et al., 2012). Adding to this, our results indicate that in early HD, DA pathways are affected differentially in women and men and that impairments are selective for learning from positive PEs. While we predicted specificity for learning from positive PEs, the finding of a gender-specific effect in patients with early HD is novel. It has

been proposed that a general gender difference in endogenous DA levels or other aspects of dopaminergic transmission (Kaasinen, Någren, Hietala, Farde, & Rinne, 2001; Laakso et al., 2002; Pohjalainen, Rinne, Någren, Syvälahti, & Hietala, 1998) may account for gender differences in the vulnerability to neuropsychiatric disorders such as depression, schizophrenia or PD (Gillies, Virdee, McArthur, & Dalley, 2014). For HD, however, penetrance and prevalence seems to be equal for both sexes. Interestingly, a large European study showed recently that women with HD exhibited more severe symptoms and a faster progression of the disease (Zielonka et al., 2013), and a large US study found that women have a longer duration of the disease (Foroud, Gray, Ivashina, & Conneally, 1999). Thus, there might be gender differences in the progression of the disease. Our results indicate a more severe impairment in learning from positive PEs in women with HD compared to men. This might be explained by an interaction of disease-specific effects with sex differences in dopaminergic transmission. Women have a higher presynaptic dopaminergic synthesis capacity (Laakso et al., 2002) and show a lower BP for [^{11}C]raclopride, suggestive of a higher striatal DA concentration (Pohjalainen et al., 1998). Further, women have been shown to have higher D2-like receptor BPs than men in frontal cortex, temporal cortex, and thalamus (Kaasinen et al., 2001). Together, these might produce an additive effect on the hyper-activation of the 'direct' pathway, and, in consequence, exaggerated learning from positive PEs especially in women with early HD. However, as positive learning rate was associated with motor symptom severity across all patients, the gender specific effect might alleviate during further progression of the disease. In line with our results, Palminteri and colleagues observed an asymmetry in favor of reward-based relative to punishment-based learning in patients with early compared to late HD and to controls (Palminteri et al., 2012). Specifically, the authors found a higher reward bias and a higher reinforcement magnitude for gains compared to losses. However, learning rates for gain and loss conditions were not different between HD groups or compared to controls in their study. Importantly, the task they used differed from the WPT in that participants had to learn to approach, i.e., select, rewarding options and to avoid, i.e., to not choose, punishing options in different conditions. Taken together, our results indicate that future work should pay special attention to sex differences in HD.

An imbalance between tonic and phasic DA signaling may lie at the heart of alterations in DA-based learning, as has been observed in attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (Badgaiyan, Sinha, Sajjad, & Wack, 2015), depression (Dunlop & Nemeroff, 2007; Mörkl, Blesl, Jahanshahi, Painold, & Holl, 2016), schizophrenia (Brunelin, Fecteau, & Suaud-Chagny, 2013; Juckel et al., 2006), obesity (Frank et al., 2012; Horstmann, Fenske, & Hankir, 2015) or PD patients on dopaminergic medication (Jahanshahi et al., 2010). Further, within healthy volunteers, the layout of the dopaminergic system seems to be intimately linked to the individual level of personality traits such as approach/avoidance bias and impulsivity (Buckholtz et al., 2010; Tomer et al., 2014).

Taken together, our results demonstrate that solving the WPT relies on the integrity of different pathways within the dopaminergic system. In line with our hypotheses, data from healthy individuals, patients with PD *on* dopaminergic medication as well as from patients with HD show that variance within each pathway is linked to specific performance differences when solving the WPT.

5. Conclusions

The present data reveal that the WPT is suitable to disentangle learning from negative and positive feedback with the help of computational modeling. The ability to learn from positive and negative feedback might prove to be a sensitive marker for the integrity of dopaminergic signal transmission. In particular, it might differentiate between the involvement of the 'direct' and 'indirect' dopaminergic pathways. The present data are interesting beyond clinical context in that imbalances of dopaminergic signaling have not only been observed for psychiatric conditions but also for obesity (Horstmann et al., 2015; Kessler, Zald, Ansari, & Cowan, 2014) and adolescence (Luciana, Wahlstrom, Porter, & Collins, 2012). Thus, future work should differentiate between learning from positive and negative feedback since these processes rely on segregated neural mechanisms. In the case of medical conditions, specific learning impairments would point to associated specific neural changes that call for different treatment options.

Author contributions & Funding

DM and Annette Horstmann designed research, MJ, LW and Anna Holl contributed data, DM and JN implemented computational model, DM analyzed data, LD contributed to model comparisons, DM and Annette Horstmann wrote paper. All authors revised and edited the manuscript.

This work was supported by grants from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), Germany (to Annette Horstmann, JN, AV; FKZ: 01EO1001), the German Research Foundation (to Annette Horstmann, JN, AV; DFG-SFB1052), and stipends from the FAZIT-STIFTUNG (to DM; FAZIT-STIFTUNG Gemeinnützige Verlagsgesellschaft mbH), and the Free State of Saxony (to DM; Landesstipendium).

REFERENCES

Aberg, K. C., Doell, K. C., & Schwartz, S. (2015). Hemispheric asymmetries in striatal reward responses relate to approach – Avoidance learning and encoding of positive – Negative prediction errors in dopaminergic midbrain regions. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 35, 14491–14500.

Agid, Y., Ruberg, M., Javoy-Agid, F., Hirsch, E., Raisman-Vozari, R., Vyas, S., et al. (1993). Are dopaminergic neurons selectively vulnerable to Parkinson's disease? *Adv. Neurol*, 60, 148–164. Available at: http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=4120205 (Accessed 25 July 2016).

Aylward, E. H., Sparks, B. F., Field, K. M., Yallapragada, V., Shpritz, B. D., Rosenblatt, A., et al. (2004). Onset and rate of striatal atrophy in preclinical Huntington disease. *Neurology*, 63, 66–72. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15249612 (Accessed 2 March 2016).

Badgaiyan, R. D., Sinha, S., Sajjad, M., & Wack, D. S. (2015). Attenuated tonic and enhanced phasic release of dopamine in attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *PLoS One, 10*, 1–14.

Beck, A. T., Steer, R. A., & Brown, G. (1996). *Manual for the beck depression inventory (BDI-II)*. TX: Psychological Corporation.

Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*, 561–571. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/13688369 (Accessed 10 January 2013).

Bodi, N., Keri, S., Nagy, H., Moustafa, A., Myers, C. E., Daw, N., et al. (2009). Reward-learning and the novelty-seeking personality: A between-and within-subjects study of the effects of dopamine agonists on young parkinsons patients. *Brain, 132*, 2385–2395.

Brunelin, J., Fecteau, S., & Suaud-Chagny, M.-F. (2013). Abnormal striatal dopamine transmission in schizophrenia. *Current Medicinal Chemistry, 20*, 397–404. Available at: http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3866953&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract (Accessed 21 January 2015).

Buckholtz, J. W., Treadway, M. T., Cowan, R. L., Neil, D., Li, R., Ansari, M. S., et al. (2010). *Dopaminergic network differences in human impulsivity* (Vol. 329, pp. 11–14).

Cepeda, C., Murphy, K. P. S., Parent, M., & Levine, M. S. (2014). The role of dopamine in Huntington's disease. *Progress in Brain Research, 211*, 235–254.

Cools, R., Altamirano, L., & D'Esposito, M. (2006). Reversal learning in Parkinson's disease depends on medication status and outcome valence. *Neuropsychologia, 44*, 1663–1673.

Cools, R., Barker, R. A., Sahakian, B. J., & Robbins, T. W. (2001). Enhanced or impaired cognitive function in Parkinson's disease as a function of dopaminergic medication and task demands. *Cerebral Cortex, 11*, 1136–1143.

Cools, R., & D'Esposito, M. (2011). Inverted-U-shaped dopamine actions on human working memory and cognitive control. *Biological Psychiatry, 69*, e113–e125.

Cools, R., Lewis, S. J. G., Clark, L., Barker, R. A., & Robbins, T. W. (2007). L-DOPA disrupts activity in the nucleus accumbens during reversal learning in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychopharmacology, 32*, 180–189.

Cox, S. M. L., Frank, M. J., Larcher, K., Fellows, L. K., Clark, C. a, Leyton, M., et al. (2015). Striatal D1 and D2 signaling differentially predict learning from positive and negative outcomes. *NeuroImage, 109*, 95–101. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.12.070.

Daunizeau, J., Adam, V., & Rigoux, L. (2014). VBA: A probabilistic treatment of nonlinear models for neurobiological and behavioural data. *PLoS Computational Biology, 10*, e1003441. Available at: http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003441.

Daw, N. D., Doherty, J. P. O., Dayan, P., Seymour, B., & Dolan, R. J. (2006). Cortical substrates for exploratory decisions in humans. *Nature, 441*, 876–879.

Day, M., Wang, Z., Ding, J., An, X., Ingham, C. A., Shering, A. F., et al. (2006). Selective elimination of glutamatergic synapses on striatopallidal neurons in Parkinson disease models. *Nature Neuroscience, 9*, 251–259. Available at: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nn1632 (Accessed 13 April 2016).

Dubois, B., Burn, D., Goetz, C., Aarsland, D., Brown, R. G., Broe, G. A., et al. (2007). Diagnostic procedures for Parkinson's disease dementia: Recommendations from the movement disorder society task force. *Movement Disorders, 22*, 2314–2324. Available at: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/mds.21844 (Accessed 25 July 2016).

Dunlop, B. W., & Nemeroff, C. B. (2007). The role of dopamine in the pathophysiology of depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 64*, 327–337. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.64.3.327 http://archpsyc.jamanetwork.com/data/Journals/PSYCH/11839/yrv60000_327_337.pdf.

Dyakonova, V. E., Chistopolsky, I. A., Dyakonova, T. L., Vorontsov, D. D., & Sakharov, D. A. (2009). Direct and decarboxylation-dependent effects of neurotransmitter precursors on firing of isolated monoaminergic neurons. *Journal of Comparative Physiology. A, Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology, 195*, 515–527.

Floresco, S. B. (2013). Prefrontal dopamine and behavioral flexibility: Shifting from an "inverted-U" toward a family of functions. *Frontiers in Neuroscience, 7*, 62. Available at: http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3630325&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract (Accessed 28 October 2013).

Folstein, M., Folstein, S., & McHugh, P. (1975). "Mini-mental state": A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 12*, 189–198. Available at: /citations?view_op=view_citation&continue=/scholar%3Fq%3Dfolstein%2Bfolstein%2Bmchugh%26hl%3Dde%26as_sdt%3D0,5%26scilib%3D1&citilm=1&citation_for_view=kGQy6cYAAAAJ:7uOkfv6XYJ4C&hl=de&oi=p (Accessed 13 April 2016).

Foroud, T., Gray, J., Ivashina, J., & Conneally, P. M. (1999). Differences in duration of Huntington's disease based on age at onset. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 66*, 52–56. Available at: http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1736160&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract.

Frank, M. J. (2005). Dynamic dopamine modulation in the basal ganglia: A neurocomputational account of cognitive deficits in medicated and nonmedicated Parkinsonism. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 17*, 51–72. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15701239.

Frank, M. J., & O'Reilly, R. C. (2006). A mechanistic account of striatal dopamine function in human cognition: Psychopharmacological studies with cabergoline and haloperidol. *Behavioral Neuroscience, 120*, 497–517.

Frank, G. K. W., Reynolds, J. R., Shott, M. E., Jappe, L., Yang, T. T., Tregellas, J. R., et al. (2012). Anorexia nervosa and obesity are associated with opposite brain reward response. *Neuropsychopharmacology, 37*, 2031–2046. Available at: http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3398719&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract (Accessed 19 December 2013).

Frank, M. J., Samanta, J., Moustafa, A. A., & Sherman, S. J. (2007a). Hold your Horses: Impulsivity, deep brain stimulation, and medication in Parkinsonism. *Science, 318*, 1309–1312. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17962524.

Frank, M. J., Scheres, A., & Sherman, S. J. (2007b). Understanding decision-making deficits in neurological conditions: Insights from models of natural action selection. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society London B Biological Sciences, 362*, 1641–1654. Available at: http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/362/1485/1641.short.

Frank, M. J., Seeberger, L. C., & O'Reilly, R. C. (2004). By carrot or by stick: Cognitive reinforcement learning in parkinsonism. *Science, 306*, 1940–1943. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15528409.

Gerfen, C. R., Engber, T. M., Mahan, L. C., Susel, Z. V. I., Chase, T. N., Monsma, F. J., et al. (1990). *D1 and D2 dopamine receptor-regulated gene expression of striatonigral and striatopallidal neurons dopamine*.

Gillies, G. E., Virdee, K., McArthur, S., & Dalley, J. W. (2014). Sex-dependent diversity in ventral tegmental dopaminergic neurons and developmental programing: A molecular, cellular and behavioral analysis. *Neuroscience, 282*, 69–85. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2014.05.033.

Goto, Y., & Grace, A. A. (2005). Dopaminergic modulation of limbic and cortical drive of nucleus accumbens in goal-directed behavior. *Nature Neuroscience, 8*, 805–812.

Goto, Y., Otani, S., & Grace, A. A. (2007). The Yin and Yang of dopamine release: A new perspective. *Neuropharmacology, 53*, 583–587. Available at: http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2078202&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract (Accessed 22 December 2014).

Grace, A. A. (1991). Phasic versus tonic dopamine release and the modulation of dopamine system responsivity: A hypothesis for the etiology of schizophrenia. *Neuroscience, 41*, 1–24.

Gray, J. (1981). A critique of Eysenck's theory of personality. In H. Eysenck (Ed.), *A model for personality* (pp. 246–276). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.

Gunn, R. N., Lammertsma, A. A., Hume, S. P., & Cunningham, V. J. (1997). Parametric imaging of ligand-receptor binding in PET using a simplified reference region model. *NeuroImage, 6*, 279–287. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9417971.

Haaxma, C. A., Bloem, B. R., Borm, G. F., Oyen, W. J. G., Leenders, K. L., Eshuis, S., et al. (2007). Gender differences in Parkinson's disease. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 78*, 819–824.

Holl, A. K., Wilkinson, L., Tabrizi, S. J., Painold, A., & Jahanshahi, M. (2012). Probabilistic classification learning with corrective feedback is selectively impaired in early Huntington's disease–evidence for the role of the striatum in learning with feedback. *Neuropsychologia, 50*, 2176–2186. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22659110 (Accessed 27 November 2012).

Horstmann, A., Fenske, W. K., & Hankir, M. K. (2015). Argument for a non-linear relationship between severity of human obesity and dopaminergic tone. *Obesity Reviews, 16*, 821–830. Available at: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/obr.12303.

Hughes, A., Daniel, S., Kilford, L., & Lees, A. (1992). Accuracy of clinical diagnosis of idiopathic Parkinson's disease: A clinico-pathological study of 100 cases. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 55*, 181–184.

Hungtington Study Group. (1996). Unified Huntington's disease rating scale: Reliability and consistency. *Movement Disorders, 11*, 136–142.

Jahanshahi, M., Wilkinson, L., Gahir, H., Dharmaindra, A., Dharmarinda, A., Dharminda, A., et al. (2010). Medication impairs probabilistic classification learning in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia, 48*, 1096–1103. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20006629 (Accessed 27 November 2012).

Jocham, G., Klein, T. A., Neumann, J., von Cramon, D. Y., Reuter, M., & Ullsperger, M. (2009). Dopamine DRD2 polymorphism alters reversal learning and associated neural activity. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 29*, 3695–3704. http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5195-08.2009.

Jocham, G., Klein, T. A., & Ullsperger, M. (2014). Differential modulation of reinforcement learning by D2 dopamine and NMDA glutamate receptor antagonism. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 34*, 13151–13162. Available at: http://www.jneurosci.org/cgi/doi/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0757-14.2014.

Juckel, G., Schlagenhauf, F., Koslowski, M., Wuestenberg, T., Villringer, A., Knutson, B., et al. (2006). Dysfunction of ventral striatal reward prediction in schizophrenia. *NeuroImage, 29*, 409–416.

Kaasinen, V., Någren, K., Hietala, J., Farde, L., & Rinne, J. O. (2001). Sex differences extrastriatal dopamine D2-like receptors in the human brain. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 158*, 308–311.

Kessler, R. M., Zald, D. H., Ansari, M. S., & Cowan, R. L. (2014). Changes in dopamine release and dopamine D2/3 receptor levels with the development of mild obesity. *Synapse*. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/syn.21738/full (Accessed 18 November 2014).

Kish, S. J., Shannak, K., & Hornykiewicz, O. (1988). Uneven pattern of dopamine loss in the striatum of patients with idiopathic Parkinson's disease. *New England Journal of Medicine, 318*, 876–880. Available at: http://www.nejm.org/doi/abs/10.1056/NEJM198804073181402 (Accessed 25 July 2016).

Klein, T. A., Neumann, J., Reuter, M., Hennig, J., von Cramon, D. Y., & Ullsperger, M. (2007). Genetically determined differences in learning from errors. *Science, 318*, 1642–1645 . http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1145044.

Knowlton, B. J., Squire, L. R., & Gluck, M. A. (1994). Probabilistic classification learning in amnesia. *Learning & Memory, 1*, 106–120.

Kravitz, A. V., Freeze, B. S., Parker, P. R. L., Kay, K., Thwin, M. T., Deisseroth, K., et al. (2010). Regulation of parkinsonian motor behaviours by optogenetic control of basal ganglia circuitry. *Nature, 466*, 622–626. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature09159.

Laakso, A., Vilkman, H., Bergman, J., Haaparanta, M., Solin, O., Syvälahti, E., et al. (2002). Sex differences in striatal presynaptic dopamine synthesis capacity in healthy subjects. *Biological Psychiatry, 52*, 759–763. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12372667.

Luciana, M., Wahlstrom, D., Porter, J. N., & Collins, P. F. (2012). Dopaminergic modulation of incentive motivation in adolescence: Age-related changes in signaling, individual differences, and implications for the development of self-regulation. *Developmental Psychology, 48*, 844–861. Available at: http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=3341492&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract (Accessed 16 January 2015).

Maril, S., Hassin-Baer, S., Cohen, O. S., & Tomer, R. (2013). Effects of asymmetric dopamine depletion on sensitivity to rewarding and aversive stimuli in Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychologia, 51*, 818–824. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2013.02.003.

Montague, P. R., Dayan, P., & Sejnowski, T. J. (1996). A framework for mesencephalic dopamine systems based on predictive Hebbian learning. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 16*, 1936–1947. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8774460.

Mörkl, S., Blesl, C., Jahanshahi, M., Painold, A., & Holl, A. K. (2016). Impaired probabilistic classification learning with feedback in patients with major depression. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory, 127*, 48–55.

Moustafa, A. A., Herzallah, M. M., & Gluck, M. A. (2012). *Dissociating the cognitive effects of levodopa vs. Dopamine agonists in a neurocomputational model of learning in Parkinson's disease*.

Moustafa, A. a, Krishna, R., Eissa, A. M., & Hewedi, D. H. (2013). Factors underlying probabilistic and deterministic stimulus-response learning performance in medicated and unmedicated patients with Parkinson's disease. *Neuropsychology, 27*, 498–510. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23876122.

Murphy, F. C., Nimmo-Smith, I., & Lawrence, A. D. (2003). Functional neuroanatomy of emotions: A meta-analysis. *Cognitive, Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience, 3*, 207–233. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14672157 (Accessed 5 August 2016).

van Oostrom, J. C. H., Dekker, M., Willemsen, A. T. M., de Jong, B. M., Roos, R. A. C., & Leenders, K. L. (2009). Changes in striatal dopamine D2 receptor binding in pre-clinical Huntington's disease. *European Journal of Neurology, 16*, 226–231. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-1331.2008.02390.x.

Palminteri, S., Justo, D., Jauffret, C., Pavlicek, B., Dauta, A., Delmaire, C., et al. (2012). Critical roles for anterior insula and dorsal striatum in punishment-based avoidance learning. *Neuron, 76*, 998–1009.

Pohjalainen, T., Rinne, J. O., Någren, K., Syvälahti, E., & Hietala, J. (1998). Sex differences in the striatal dopamine D2 receptor

binding characteristics in vivo. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 155*, 768–773.

Poldrack, R. a, Clark, J., Paré-Blagoev, E. J., Shohamy, D., Creso Moyano, J., Myers, C., et al. (2001). Interactive memory systems in the human brain. *Nature, 414*, 546–550. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11734855.

Porat, O., Hassin-Baer, S., Cohen, O. S., Markus, A., & Tomer, R. (2014). Asymmetric dopamine loss differentially affects effort to maximize gain or minimize loss. *Cortex, 51*, 82–91. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2013.10.004.

Rodriguez, P., Aron, A., & Poldrack, R. (2006). Ventral-striatal/nucleus-accumbens sensitivity to prediction errors during classification learning. *Human Brain Mapping, 27*, 306–313. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16092133 (Accessed 14 January 2015).

van der Schaaf, M. E., van Schouwenburg, M. R., Geurts, D. E. M., Schellekens, A. F. A., Buitelaar, J. K., Verkes, R. J., et al. (2014). Establishing the dopamine dependency of human striatal signals during reward and punishment reversal learning. *Cerebral Cortex, 24*, 633–642. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhs344.

Schultz, W. (2002). Getting formal with dopamine and reward. *Neuron, 36*, 241–263. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12383780 (Accessed 1 December 2014).

Schultz, W., Dayan, P., & Montague, P. R. (1997). A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science, 275*, 1593–1599. Available at: http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/doi/10.1126/science.275.5306.1593 (Accessed 20 March 2014).

Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics, 6*, 461–464. http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176344136.

Shoulson, I., & Fahn, S. (1979). Huntington disease: Clinical care and evaluation. *Neurology, 29*, 1–3. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/154626 (Accessed 13 April 2016).

Stephan, K. E., Penny, W. D., Daunizeau, J., Moran, R. J., & Friston, K. J. (2009). Bayesian model selection for group studies. *Neuroimage, 46*, 1004–1017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2009.03.025.

Surmeier, D. J., Ding, J., Day, M., Wang, Z., & Shen, W. (2007). D1 and D2 dopamine-receptor modulation of striatal glutamatergic signaling in striatal medium spiny neurons. *Trends in Neurosciences, 30*, 228–235. Available at: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0166223607000690.

Sutton, S. K., & Davidson, R. J. (1997). Prefrontal brain asymmetry: A biological substrate of the behavioral approach and inhibition systems. *Psychological Science, 8*, 204–210. Available at: http://pss.sagepub.com/lookup/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1997.tb00413.x.

Tobler, P. N., Dickinson, A., & Schultz, W. (2003). Coding of predicted reward omission by dopamine neurons in a conditioned inhibition paradigm. *The Journal of Neuroscience, 23*, 10402–10410.

Tomer, R., Slagter, H. A., Christian, B. T., Fox, A. S., King, C. R., Murali, D., et al. (2014). Love to win or hate to lose? Asymmetry of dopamine D2 receptor binding predicts sensitivity to reward versus punishment. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 26*, 1039–1048. Available at: http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/jocn_a_00544.

Van Den Eeden, S. K., Tanner, C. M., Bernstein, A. L., Fross, R. D., Leimpeter, A., Bloch, D. A., et al. (2003). Incidence of Parkinson's disease: Variation by age, gender, and race/ethnicity. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 157*, 1015–1022. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwg068.

Vonsattel, J. P., Myers, R. H., Stevens, T. J., Ferrante, R. J., Bird, E. D., & Richardson, E. P., Jr. (1985). Neuropathological classification of Huntington's disease. *Journal of Neuropathology and Experimental Neurology, 44*, 559–577. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2932539.

Wager, T. D., Phan, K. L., Liberzon, I., & Taylor, S. F. (2003). Valence, gender, and lateralization of functional brain anatomy in emotion: A meta-analysis of findings from neuroimaging. *NeuroImage, 19*, 513–531.

Weeks, R. A., Piccini, P., Harding, A. E., & Brooks, D. J. (1996). Striatal D1 and D2 dopamine receptor loss in asymptomatic mutation carriers of Huntington's disease. *Annals of Neurology, 40*, 49–54. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8687191 (Accessed 15 February 2016).

Wilkinson, L., Tai, Y. F., Lin, C. S., Lagnado, D. A., Brooks, D. J., Piccini, P., et al. (2014). Probabilistic classification learning with corrective feedback is associated with in vivo striatal dopamine release in the ventral striatum, while learning without feedback is not. *Human Brain Mapping, 35*, 5106–5115. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24777947 (Accessed 20 September 2014).

Zielonka, D., Marinus, J., Roos, R. A. C., De Michele, G., Di Donato, S., Putter, H., et al. (2013). The influence of gender on phenotype and disease progression in patients with Huntington's disease. *Parkinsonism Related Disorders, 19*, 192–197. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.parkreldis.2012.09.012.