



Slaney, C. L., Hales, C. A., & Robinson, E. S. J. (2018). Rat models of reward deficits in psychiatric disorders. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 22, 136-142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2018.05.001>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

License (if available):  
CC BY

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1016/j.cobeha.2018.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2018.05.001)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via Elsevier at DOI: 10.1016/j.cobeha.2018.05.001. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms>



# Rat models of reward deficits in psychiatric disorders

Chloe L Slaney, Claire A Hales and Emma SJ Robinson

Loss of interest in rewarding activities is a hallmark of many psychiatric disorders and may be relevant for neurodegenerative disorders and patients suffering from brain injury. There is increasing evidence that deficits in reward-related behaviour are more complex than previously described. The traditional view of anhedonia as ‘the inability to experience pleasure’ may be too limited to fully encompass the types of reward deficit observed in these patients. Developments in methods to measure different aspects of reward processing in humans and animals are starting to provide insights into the complexity of this behaviour. In this article we consider the rodent models which have traditionally been used to study reward deficits in psychiatric disorders and consider their limitations relative to clinical findings. We then discuss work where methods derived from human neuropsychological tests are providing insights into the complexity of reward-related behaviour. Specifically, we consider tasks which investigate different aspects of reward-related behaviour focusing on learning and memory as well as decision-making and consider what these may mean in terms of how we model reward deficits in rodents.

## Address

School of Physiology, Pharmacology & Neuroscience, Biomedical Sciences Building, University Walk, Bristol BS8 4PX, UK

Corresponding author: Robinson, Emma S.J. ([pmesjr@bris.ac.uk](mailto:pmesjr@bris.ac.uk))

**Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences** 2018, **22**:136–142

This review comes from a themed issue on **Apathy and motivation**

Edited by **Christopher Pryce** and **Masud Husain**

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2018.05.001>

2352-1546/© 2018 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## Introduction

Deficits in reward processing are observed across a range of psychiatric disorders [1–6]. More broadly, impairments in reward processing may contribute to the observed motivational deficits, loss of interest in social interaction, and apathy. Whilst reward deficits are clearly an important feature of these clinical conditions, there are currently no treatments which specifically target these symptoms. Animal models are an important element of aetiological studies and drug development programmes. However, using animals to study complex human psychological symptoms is often challenging.

In this article, we consider why traditional consummatory and motivational tests for anhedonia may be limited in terms of providing a valid translational approach to studying the reward deficits that are most prevalent in these different patient populations. We also consider whether new tasks, which look at more complex processing of reward information, may provide a better approach. Specifically, we discuss new data from models looking at reward learning and decision-making as well as studies where biases in reward-related behaviour have been linked to changes in affective state.

## What is anhedonia?

Historically, anhedonia was defined as an ‘inability to experience pleasure’ [7]. However, in the last 20 years, knowledge relating to the neurobiology of reward and how we consider this in relation to anhedonia has developed. This has resulted in a growing interest in how we define anhedonia and consequently how we model this in rodents. Whilst the exact definitions are debated (see [Table 1](#) and review articles [8–11,12\*,13,14]), it is suggested that symptoms of anhedonia observed in patients may be due to deficits in one or several different components of reward processing: firstly, consummatory experience of reward, secondly motivation for reward, thirdly reward learning and finally decision making. In relation to major depressive disorder, impairments in reward-related behaviour are more broadly set out in the DSM-5 as a ‘loss of interest or pleasure in previously rewarding activities’. Reward-related behavioural deficits are also considered within the recent concept of Research Domains Criteria (RDoC) framework for mental health research [15–17]. The positive valance system makes up one of the key domains which has been included in this framework. In this article, we will focus our discussion on methods to assess these different subcomponents of reward (see [Figure 1](#), panel a for summary). We briefly discuss why traditional consummatory and motivational tests for anhedonia may be limited in terms of providing a valid translational approach to studying the reward deficits that are most prevalent in different patient populations. We also discuss whether recently developed methods looking at reward learning, memory and decision-making may provide a better approach. Specifically, we discuss new data from behavioural tasks which have been looking at reward learning and decision-making as well as studies where biases in reward-related cognition have been linked to changes in the emotional state of the animal, more commonly referred to as affective state in non-human species.

Table 1

**Summary of some of the key papers relating to the discussions about how we define anhedonia and reward-related deficits in psychiatric disorders [7,8,9,12\*,13,14]**

Year	Definition of anhedonia	Reference
1896	'The inability to experience pleasure'	Ribot (1896)
2003	Liking Wanting	Robinson and Berridge (2003)
2008	Liking, wanting, learning (pleasure cycle = appetitive, consummatory and satiety)	Berridge and Kringelbach (2008)
2011	Distinction between consummatory, motivational and decision-making	Treadway and Zald (2011)
2012	Distinction between anhedonia and cognitive aspects of reward	Der-Avakian and Markou (2012)
2015	'Impairments in the ability to pursue, experience and/or learn about pleasure'	Thomsen (2015)

### Limitations associated with consummatory and motivational deficits in reward-related behaviour in rats

Most studies investigating reward processing in rodents have used tasks based on consummatory behaviour (hedonia) and motivation for reward (see [1,2,12\*,13,14,18,19] for detailed review of relevant methodology). For example, reward sensitivity can be measured directly using intracerebral self-stimulation methods where deficits resulting from chronic stress are observed as an increase in the stimulation threshold [20]. A simpler and more commonly used method to study anhedonia, particularly for depression research, has been the sucrose preference test (SPT) where the ability of an animal to detect and show a preference for a weak sucrose or saccharin solution over water is measured [21]. Animals in putative negative affective states following exposure to chronic stress show a reduced sucrose preference [21–23]. However, not all depression models show impairments in the SPT and studies in Schizophrenia models also fail to observe deficits [1,24]. Additionally, in the human literature, depressed patients do not exhibit deficits in a similar sweet taste test [25,26] suggesting limited translational validity of the SPT.

Motivation for reward tasks, such as progressive ratio and effort-based tasks, provide an alternative method to study reward-related behaviours [15,27]. In the progressive ratio task, over several trials rats are required to perform incrementally higher operant responses (e.g. press a lever) in order to obtain the same amount of reward. Motivation in this task is determined as the point at which rats stop responding (i.e. their 'breakpoint'). Whilst this task displays reasonable translational validity, with both humans and rodents displaying motivational deficits related to dopamine depletion [28–30] models of depression (e.g. chronic mild stress and maternal separation) and other psychiatric disorders in rodents display less consistent changes in motivation [31,32\*,33], although also see [34\*]. In progressive ratio tasks, increased effort (number of responses) is also associated with an increase in time to obtain reward and therefore may be confounded by motor impairments. There is also the potential for animal's tolerance to delayed reward to contribute to behavioural


outcomes which, whilst potentially of interest, may relate more to neural circuits modulating impulse control as opposed to reward. Because of the limitations of the standard progressive ratio task, effort-based choice tasks have been developed where animals are required to choose between an easy to obtain low-value reward versus a high-value/high-effort reward [5,35\*\*,36,37\*,38,39]. This task requires the animal to make a choice based on motivation for the different reward option and hence also models decision-making behaviour. Validation of the model is still limited but there is a clear translational advantage with similar human methods now being used [40]. More detailed discussion about these tasks and their associated psychopharmacology are reviewed in [1,18,38,40].

### New developments in methods to study reward-related cognition and affective biases

Advances in measuring reward-related behaviour in humans, such as the move away from subjective, questionnaire-based methods and the development of computer-based neuropsychological tasks, have supported reverse translation into animal research. An excellent example of this is the probabilistic reward learning task [41–43] and probabilistic reversal learning task [44,45]. In both models, the animal is required to learn contingencies associated with different cues despite receiving false feedback resulting from the probabilistic nature of the reward delivery. Probability of reward can be altered to increase task difficulty, and response bias, discriminability, accuracy, reaction time and sensitivity to positive and negative feedback can all be collected. Tasks using operant chambers with spatial cues or tones, a touch-screen task and methods using odour cues have all been piloted [1,43]. However, it should be noted that there are marked differences between human and rat data in terms of the proportion of lose-shift responses after misleading negative feedback suggesting the underlying biology may be different.

In our own laboratory, we started looking at how affective states could modify reward learning as part of our research into affective biases [46,47]. Affective bias is a term used to describe how affective states influence cognitive

Figure 1



Rodent tasks which provide quantified measures of the different aspects of reward processing have been developed. Summarised in table (a) are examples of these different methods. Recent developments have seen a shift from the more typical measures of reward deficits based on changes in hedonia or motivation to methods which measure the cognitive aspects of reward such as learning memory and decision-making. Panels (b,c) illustrate two tasks which we have recently developed to study how reward-related behaviour is altered by affective state. The affective bias test is used to study biases in reward learning and memory and the judgement bias task which provides a method to study interpretation biases in the interpretation of ambiguous information and an animal's anticipation of positive or negative outcomes. Panel (b) illustrates the ABT method and some of the data obtained following manipulations administered during the learning phase of the task only (acquisition and consolidation). We can also test how these biases are subsequently modulated by also administering treatments before the preference test (recall) to determine if they alter the previously learnt bias. These studies have revealed that antidepressant and pro-depressant manipulations induce a subsequent bias in the reward-related memory. Following induction of a negative bias, pre-treatment with ketamine but not the conventional antidepressant venlafaxine results in an attenuation of the bias suggesting these different types of antidepressant can differentially modulate reward-related learning and memory. Dissociable effects between conventional and rapid onset antidepressants have also been observed in the judgement bias task with evidence of difference in the time course of effects. As illustrated in panel (c), the judgement bias task involves first training animals in an operant task where responses to obtain different values of reward, (or reward versus punishment avoidance) are first trained. Animals' interpretation biases are then probed using a testing phase where both reference and intermediate ambiguous cues are presented, and the animals responses recorded. In this measure of reward-related decision-making, chronic but not acute treatment with antidepressants induces a shift in decision-making biases. In contrast, ketamine induces an immediate positive bias suggesting different underlying mechanisms of action which may help explain the temporal differences observed with these treatments in patients. More details of the methods for the affective bias test and judgement bias task are discussed in the main text.

processes to bias responding. Biases have been observed across many different cognitive domains with clinical studies demonstrating impairments in emotional interpretation, memory and decision-making, and in response to acute doses of antidepressants [48–51,52\*]. To translate

this work to animals, we needed to use stimuli and outcomes appropriate to the species [53\*\*]. This was achieved by pairing previously neutral cues with emotionally-valenced outcomes: obtaining reward or avoiding punishment. The use of reward-related learning and

memory in these tasks, as well as decision-making behaviour, has led to new insights into how these are modified in psychiatric disorders.

The affective bias test (ABT, [Figure 1](#), panel b) was designed to investigate how affective state at the time of learning would impact on the subsequent reward value attributed to the memory of that experience [54]. Animals are first presented with a simple task where they are required to learn the association between a specific cue (a digging substrate) and a rewarding outcome (a food pellet). These Pavlovian associations are learnt on independent days with the reward value kept constant, but a manipulation can be applied before one of the cue-reward associations. Because of the within-subject design, a subsequent choice test can be used to assess the individual animal's preference between the two previously learnt reward-associated cues. Where the manipulation leads to a positive affective state, animals show a preference for the reward-cue paired during treatment versus the cue paired during the control condition, a positive bias [54–56]. The opposite is seen with manipulations which induce a negative affective state, or are pro-depressant, with animals biasing their responding away from the treatment-paired cue [54,55,57]. Importantly, positive biases are seen with acute antidepressant treatment whilst negative biases are observed following treatments known to have pro-depressant effects ([Figure 1](#), panel b, effect on acquisition and consolidation). Administering treatments immediately post discrimination learning showed similar effects, suggesting consolidation is the most likely aspect of learning being modulated [54]. Interestingly, we did not find any effects with dopaminergic drugs, suggesting a distinct underlying neurobiology [54]. Further studies have linked the modulation of reward-learning in this task to the amygdala [58]. Whilst the amygdala is known to play a role in Pavlovian conditioning, we observe an interesting dissociation between biases induced by manipulations of affective state (attenuated) versus those induced by changes in absolute reward (not affected).

To test whether these treatment-induced biases can be subsequently altered, we can also administer a treatment immediately before the choice test ([Figure 1](#), panel b, effect on recall, [58]). In this version of the ABT, we observe an interesting dissociation between delayed and rapid onset antidepressants [58]. The NMDA antagonist, ketamine but not the monoaminergic antidepressant, venlafaxine, was able to attenuate previously learnt biases which we propose may help explain its rapid onset of action. We linked this effect to the medial prefrontal cortex where inactivation using the GABA agonist muscimol induced similar effects. To date, we have shown that the ABT can provide a novel method to study how manipulations at the time of learning can impact on long term memory for reward and how this influences

behaviour when the animal re-encounters the cue which predicts that specific reward.

The assay may also be interesting for research relating to the learning of rewards of different absolute values, an aspect of reward-related cognition which is not currently addressed within the basic research field. We made some early attempts to test this by developing a modified version of the assay which measures associations between distinct, independently learnt cues that predict different values of reward [57]. We have termed this a reward-induced positive bias and normal animals show a bias towards the cue paired with a higher value reward. Initial studies have focussed on putative models of depression and we have observed significant deficits in reward memory when animals are treated with chronic corticosterone, chronic pro-depressant drug treatments and in animals exposed to early life adversity [59\*\*]. Importantly, this effect is distinct from consummatory deficits as, with the exception of the chronic corticosterone treatment, the same animals do not show impairments in the SPT [59\*\*]. A similar deficit in reward-induced positive bias has also been observed in the sub-chronic PCP model of schizophrenia which similarly does not show impaired reward-related behaviour in other methods [60].

Another task which investigates affective biases, but this time in relation to reward-related decision-making, is the judgement bias task [46,61]. The task tests whether the affective state of an animal biases decisions-making during presentation of ambiguous information. There have been two different versions developed which either use reward versus punishment avoidance or high-reward versus low-reward ([46], see [Figure 1](#), panel c). Animals are first trained to associate specific cues (reference cues) with predicting a high-value or low-value reward (or avoidance of punishment). Once a stable baseline level of responding has been achieved, the animals are presented with intermediate ambiguous cues and their responses (anticipation of high-value or low-value reward) used to indicate a positive or negative bias. Both versions of the task have shown that animals in a putative negative affective state are more likely to anticipate a less positive or negative event [61–68]. Pharmacological studies have revealed an interesting dissociation between acute and chronic effects of monoaminergic antidepressants, with effects only observed following chronic administration [64]. In contrast, the rapid-onset antidepressant ketamine induces an immediate positive bias [64]. A major advantage of the judgement bias task is its ability to differentiate between biases in decision-making (responses made to ambiguous probe cues) and changes in consummatory or motivational aspects of reward (responses made to reference cues). In our studies, we have been able to demonstrate specific changes in decision-making behaviour without effects on consummatory or motivational measures [63,64].

## Conclusions

Deficits in reward processing are no longer considered a unitary construct and these new developments in animal models support this. A patient may report a loss of interest in pleasurable activities, but the underlying cause of this deficit may lie within one or more of several distinct domains which ultimately contribute to reward-related behaviour. Questionnaire measures are limited in terms of their ability to differentiate between these different subcomponents. To address this, new translational methods to study reward-related cognition in both human and animal studies have been developed and are starting to yield important findings. Further studies comparing different patient populations using a test battery designed to probe different types of reward deficit are needed. Similarly, more detailed validation of the rodent tasks discussed here are required, particularly to extend the findings from depression-related research to other areas including other psychiatric disorders and neurodegenerative conditions. On the basis of clinical findings, impairments in reward-related cognition may represent a more relevant phenotype and the new tasks discussed here offer a pre-clinical approach to study these.

## Conflict of interest statement

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. ESJR has current research funding from Boehringer Ingelheim and Eli Lilly which supports research in this area but they have had no influence on the content of this article. ESJR has also previously received funding from Pfizer and MSD in the form of academic research grants.

## Acknowledgements

This work has been developed with support from the BBSRC, MRC and Wellcome Trust as well as academic research grants from Pfizer and Boehringer Ingelheim and the British Pharmacological Society Integrative Pharmacology Fund. CS is funded by a Wellcome Trust Neural Dynamics PhD studentship, CAH is funded by the BBSRC (BB/N015762/1).

## References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as

- of special interest
  - of outstanding interest
1. Der-Avakian A, Barnes SA, Markou A, Pizzagalli DA: **Translational assessment of reward and motivational deficits in psychiatric disorders.** *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* 2016, **28**:231-262.
  2. Barnes SA, Der-Avakian A, Markou A: **Anhedonia, avolition, and anticipatory deficits: assessments in animals with relevance to the negative symptoms of schizophrenia.** *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2014, **24**:744-758.
  3. Reddy LF, Horan WP, Green MF: **Motivational deficits and negative symptoms in schizophrenia: concepts and assessments.** *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* 2016, **27**:357-373.
  4. Epstein J, Silbersweig D: **The neuropsychiatric spectrum of motivational disorders.** *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2015, **27**:7-18.
  5. Salamone JD, Koychev I, Correa M, McGuire P: **Neurobiological basis of motivational deficits in psychopathology.** *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2015, **25**:1225-1238.
  6. Barch DM, Pagliaccio D, Luking K: **Mechanisms underlying motivational deficits in psychopathology: similarities and differences in depression and schizophrenia.** *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* 2016, **27**:411-449.
  7. Ribot T: *La psychologie des sentiment [The Psychology of Feelings]*. Paris: Felix Alcan; 1896.
  8. Berridge KC, Robinson TE: **Parsing reward.** *Trends Neurosci* 2003, **26**:507-513.
  9. Berridge KC, Kringelbach ML: **Affective neuroscience of pleasure: reward in humans and animals.** *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2008, **199**:457-480.
  10. Kringelbach ML, Berridge KC: **The functional neuroanatomy of pleasure and happiness.** *Discov Med* 2010, **9**:579-587.
  11. Berridge KC, Kringelbach ML: **Building a neuroscience of pleasure and well-being.** *Psychol Well-being* 2011, **1**:1-3.
  12. Thomsen KR: **Measuring anhedonia: impaired ability to pursue, experience, and learn about reward.** *Front Psychol* 2015, **6**:1409.
- This article provides a really useful synopsis of the different ideas relating to how we define anhedonia and what this may mean for different methods to measure reward deficits in psychiatric disorders
13. Treadway MT, Zald DH: **Reconsidering anhedonia in depression: lessons from translational neuroscience.** *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 2011, **35**:537-555.
  14. Der-Avakian A, Markou A: **The neurobiology of anhedonia and other reward-related deficits.** *Trends Neurosci* 2012, **35**:68-77.
  15. Insel T, Cuthbert B, Garvey M, Heinssen R, Pine DS, Quinn K, Sanislow C, Wang P: **Research domain criteria (RDoC): toward a new classification framework for research on mental disorders.** *Am J Psychiatry* 2010, **167**:748-751.
  16. Cuthbert BN, Insel TR: **Toward the future of psychiatric diagnosis: the seven pillars of RDoC.** *BMC Med* 2013, **11**:126.
  17. Insel TR: **The NIMH research domain criteria (RDoC) project: precision medicine for psychiatry.** *Am J Psychiatry* 2014, **171**:395-397.
  18. Slattery DA, Cryan JF: **Modelling depression in animals: at the interface of reward and stress pathways.** *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2017, **234**:1451-1465.
  19. Treadway MT, Zald DH: **Parsing anhedonia: translational models of reward-processing deficits in psychopathology.** *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2013, **22**:244-249.
  20. Der-Avakian A, Mazei-Robison MS, Kesby JP, Nestler EJ, Markou A: **Enduring deficits in brain reward function after chronic social defeat in rats: susceptibility, resilience, and antidepressant response.** *Biol Psychiatry* 2014, **76**:542-549.
  21. Willner P, Towell A, Sampson D, Sophokleous S, Muscat R: **Reduction of sucrose preference by chronic unpredictable mild stress, and its restoration by a tricyclic antidepressant.** *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 1987, **93**:358-364.
  22. Bartolomucci A, Pederzani T, Sacerdote P, Panerai AE, Parmigiani S, Palanza P: **Behavioral and physiological characterization of male mice under chronic psychosocial stress.** *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 2004, **29**:899-910.
  23. Gregus A, Wintink AJ, Davis AC, Kalynchuk LE: **Effect of repeated corticosterone injections and restraint stress on anxiety and depression-like behavior in male rats.** *Behav Brain Res* 2005, **156**:105-114.
  24. Neill JC, Harte MK, Haddad PM, Lydall ES, Dwyer DM: **Acute and chronic effects of nmda receptor antagonists in rodents, relevance to negative symptoms of schizophrenia: a translational link to humans.** *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2014, **24**:822-835.
  25. Dichter GS, Smoski MJ, Kampov-Polevoy AB, Gallop R, Garbutt JC: **Unipolar depression does not moderate responses to the sweet taste test.** *Depress Anxiety* 2010, **27**:859-863.
  26. Scinska A, Sienkiewicz-Jarosz H, Kuran W, Ryglewicz D, Rogowski A, Wrobel E, Korkosz A, Kukwa A, Kostowski W,

- Bienkowski P: **Depressive symptoms and taste reactivity in humans.** *Physiol Behav* 2004, **82**:899-904.
27. Der-Avakian A, Pizzagalli DA: **Translational assessments of reward and anhedonia: a tribute to athina markou.** *Biol Psychiatry* 2018.
28. Aberman JE, Ward SJ, Salamone JD: **Effects of dopamine antagonists and accumbens dopamine depletions on time-constrained progressive-ratio performance.** *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 1998, **61**:341-348.
29. Barrett SP, Pihl RO, Benkelfat C, Brunelle C, Young SN, Leyton M: **The role of dopamine in alcohol self-administration in humans: Individual differences.** *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2008, **18**:439-447.
30. Cawley EI, Park S, aan het Rot M, Sancton K, Benkelfat C, Young SN, Boivin DB, Leyton M: **Dopamine and light: dissecting effects on mood and motivational states in women with subsyndromal seasonal affective disorder.** *J Psychiatry Neurosci* 2013, **38**:388-397.
31. Barr AM, Phillips AG: **Chronic mild stress has no effect on responding by rats for sucrose under a progressive ratio schedule.** *Physiol Behav* 1998, **64**:591-597.
32. Shalev U, Kafkafi N: **Repeated maternal separation does not alter sucrose-reinforced and open-field behaviors.** *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 2002, **73**:115-122.
- This article demonstrates pharmacological validity for an effort for reward choice task which looks at an animals willingness to exert higher levels of effort to gain a higher value reward. Unlike the progressive ratio task, this method includes a degree of decision-making behaviour and is less likely to be confounded by changes in tolerance to delay. The ability to measure consumption levels of the low effort reward can also provide information about changes in appetite.
33. Amitai N, Powell SB, Young JW: **Phencyclidine increased while isolation rearing did not affect progressive ratio responding in rats: investigating potential models of amotivation in schizophrenia.** *Behav Brain Res* 2017.
34. Leventopoulos M, Russig H, Feldon J, Pryce CR, Opacka-Juffry J: **Early deprivation leads to long-term reductions in motivation for reward and 5-HT1A binding and both effects are reversed by fluoxetine.** *Neuropharmacology* 2009, **56**:692-701.
- Using the effort for reward task, this study suggests that antidepressants targeting different monoamine substrates do not have the same effect when looking at this measure of motivation and decisions-making. The dopaminergic system is strongly implicated in the task although the drugs are all tested against a tetrabenazine-induced impairment which may influence the results and studies in disease models would be useful.
35. Salamone JD, Correa M, Nunes EJ, Randall PA, Pardo M: **The behavioral pharmacology of effort-related choice behavior: dopamine, adenosine and beyond.** *J Exp Anal Behav* 2012, **97**:125-146.
- Using a probabilistic reward learning task, this study reveals that the rapid onset antidepressant ketamine has a specific effect on the sensitivity of animals to misleading negative feedback. The probabilistic reward learning task is an excellent example of a translational method where very similar tasks and resulting variables are measured in humans and animals.
36. Nunes EJ, Randall PA, Hart EE, Freeland C, Yohn SE, Baqi Y, Müller CE, López-Cruz L, Correa M, Salamone JD: **Effort-related motivational effects of the VMAT-2 inhibitor tetrabenazine: Implications for animal models of the motivational symptoms of depression.** *J Neurosci* 2013, **33**:19120-19130.
37. Yohn SE, Thompson C, Randall PA, Lee CA, Müller CE, Baqi Y, Correa M, Salamone JD: **The VMAT-2 inhibitor tetrabenazine alters effort-related decision making as measured by the T-maze barrier choice task: reversal with the adenosine A2A antagonist MSX-3 and the catecholamine uptake blocker bupropion.** *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2015, **232**:1313-1323.
- Evidence showing that modulating GABAergic function in the rodent prefrontal cortex induces deficits in reward-related decision-making in an effort for reward task. These findings are particularly relevant to schizophrenia.
38. Salamone JD, Correa M, Yohn S, Lopez Cruz L, San Miguel N, Alatorre L: **The pharmacology of effort-related choice behavior: dopamine, depression, and individual differences.** *Behav Process* 2016, **127**:3-17.
39. Yohn SE, Collins SL, Contreras-Mora HM, Errante EL, Rowland MA, Correa M, Salamone JD: **Not all antidepressants are created equal: differential effects of monoamine uptake inhibitors on effort-related choice behavior.** *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2016, **41**:686-694.
40. Treadway MT, Bossaller N, Shelton RC, Zald DH: **Effort-based decision-making in major depressive disorder: a translational model of motivational anhedonia.** *J Abnorm Psychol* 2012, **121**:553-558.
41. Der-Avakian A, D'Souza MS, Potter DN, Chartoff EH, Carlezon WA Jr, Pizzagalli DA, Markou A: **Social defeat disrupts reward learning and potentiates striatal nociceptin/orphanin fq mrmn in rats.** *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2017, **234**:1603-1614.
42. Piantadosi PT, Khayambashi S, Schluter MG, Kutarna A, Floresco SB: **Perturbations in reward-related decision-making induced by reduced prefrontal cortical gaba transmission: relevance for psychiatric disorders.** *Neuropharmacology* 2016, **101**:279-290.
43. Der-Avakian A, D'Souza MS, Pizzagalli DA, Markou A: **Assessment of reward responsiveness in the response bias probabilistic reward task in rats: implications for cross-species translational research.** *Transl Psychiatry* 2013, **3**:e297.
44. Bari A, Theobald DE, Caprioli D, Mar AC, Aidoo-Micah A, Dalley JW, Robbins TW: **Serotonin modulates sensitivity to reward and negative feedback in a probabilistic reversal learning task in rats.** *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2010, **35**:1290-1301.
45. Rychlik M, Bollen E, Rygula R: **Ketamine decreases sensitivity of male rats to misleading negative feedback in a probabilistic reversal-learning task.** *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2017, **234**:613-620.
46. Hales CA, Stuart SA, Anderson MH, Robinson ES: **Modelling cognitive affective biases in major depressive disorder using rodents.** *Br J Pharmacol* 2014, **171**:4524-4538.
47. Stuart SA, Butler P, Robinson ES: *Animals models of risk factors for suicidal ideation and behaviour.* (Chapter 18) Switzerland: Springer International Publishing; 2014.
48. Leppänen JM: **Emotional information processing in mood disorders: a review of behavioral and neuroimaging findings.** *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 2006, **19**:34-39.
49. Pringle A, Browning M, Cowen PJ, Harmer CJ: **A cognitive neuropsychological model of antidepressant drug action.** *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry* 2011, **35**:1586-1592.
50. Roiser JP, Elliott R, Sahakian BJ: **Cognitive mechanisms of treatment in depression.** *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2012, **37**:117-136.
51. Elliott R, Rubinsztein JS, Sahakian BJ, Dolan RJ: **The neural basis of mood-congruent processing biases in depression.** *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2002, **59**:597-604.
52. Robinson ES, Roiser JP: **Affective biases in humans and animals.** *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* 2016, **28**:263-286.
- This study describes a novel version of the affective bias test where animals are required to learn about different values of reward and their association with distinct cues. Whilst normal animals are able to develop a bias toward cues which predict higher value reward, animals in a putative negative affective state do not. This may provide a novel approach to studying reward-related learning and memory deficits and could help explain why patients with depression show reductions in goal-directed behaviours.
53. Paul ES, Harding EJ, Mendl M: **Measuring emotional processes in animals: the utility of a cognitive approach.** *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* 2005, **29**:469-491.
- This study provides the first evidence for a dissociation between delayed and rapid onset antidepressants in a translational model relevant to major depressive disorder. In this study using the affective bias test, conventional antidepressants are shown to bias new learning whereas ketamine can modify already acquired affective biases. These differences in the way that the drugs interfere with these neuropsychological processes

could help to explain the difference in the time course of their clinical effects.

54. Stuart SA, Butler P, Munafo MR, Nutt DJ, Robinson ES: **A translational rodent assay of affective biases in depression and antidepressant therapy.** *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2013, **38**:1625-1635.
  55. Hinchcliffe JK, Stuart SA, Mendl M, Robinson ESJ: **Further validation of the affective bias test for predicting antidepressant and pro-depressant risk: effects of pharmacological and social manipulations in male and female rats.** *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2017.
  56. Refsgaard LK, Haubro K, Pickering DS, Stuart SA, Robinson ES, Andreasen JT: **Effects of sertraline, duloxetine, vortioxetine, and idazoxan in the rat affective bias test.** *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 2016, **233**:3763-3770.
  57. Stuart SA, Wood CM, Robinson ESJ: **Using the affective bias test to predict drug-induced negative affect: implications for drug safety.** *Br J Pharmacol* 2017, **174**:3200-3210.
  58. Stuart SA, Butler P, Munafo MR, Nutt DJ, Robinson ES: **Distinct neuropsychological mechanisms may explain delayed- versus rapid-onset antidepressant efficacy.** *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2015, **40**:2165-2174.
  59. Robinson ESJ: **Translational new approaches for investigating mood disorders in rodents and what they may reveal about the underlying neurobiology of major depressive disorder.** *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 2018:373.
- This paper describes the most recent observations in an affective bias task which looks at decisions-making behaviour in rats during presentation of ambiguous information. The study reveals how delayed versus rapid onset antidepressants have differential effects on animals behavioural response to an ambiguous cue, intermediate between cues which predict a high value or low value reward. The effects of conventional delayed onset antidepressants required chronic treatment and develop slowly. In contrast, the rapid onset antidepressant, ketamine induces an immediate positive bias following acute administration with animals more likely to anticipate the more positive outcome.
60. Sahin C, Doostdar N, Neill JC: **Towards the development of improved tests for negative symptoms of schizophrenia in a validated animal model.** *Behav Brain Res* 2016, **312**:93-101.
  61. Harding EJ, Paul ES, Mendl M: **Animal behaviour: cognitive bias and affective state.** *Nature* 2004, **427**:312.
  62. Enkel T, Gholizadeh D, von Bohlen Und Halbach O, Sanchis-Segura C, Hurlmann R, Spanagel R, Gass P, Vollmayr B: **Ambiguous-cue interpretation is biased under stress- and depression-like states in rats.** *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2010, **35**:1008-1015.
  63. Hales CA, Robinson ES, Houghton CJ: **Diffusion modelling reveals the decision making processes underlying negative judgement bias in rats.** *PLOS ONE* 2016, **11**:e0152592.
  64. Hales CA, Houghton CJ, Robinson ESJ: **Behavioural and computational methods reveal differential effects for how delayed and rapid onset antidepressants effect decision making in rats.** *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2017.
  65. Rygula R, Abumaria N, Flugge G, Fuchs E, Ruther E, Havemann-Reinecke U: **Anhedonia and motivational deficits in rats: Impact of chronic social stress.** *Behav Brain Res* 2005, **162**:127-134.
  66. Papciak J, Popik P, Fuchs E, Rygula R: **Chronic psychosocial stress makes rats more 'pessimistic' in the ambiguous-cue interpretation paradigm.** *Behav Brain Res* 2013, **256**:305-310.
  67. Rygula R, Papciak J, Popik P: **The effects of acute pharmacological stimulation of the 5-HT, NA and DA systems on the cognitive judgement bias of rats in the ambiguous-cue interpretation paradigm.** *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2014, **24**:1103-1111.
  68. Rygula R, Szczech E, Papciak J, Nikiforuk A, Popik P: **The effects of cocaine and mazindol on the cognitive judgement bias of rats in the ambiguous-cue interpretation paradigm.** *Behav Brain Res* 2014, **270**:206-212.