Acta Neuropsychiatrica

cambridge.org/neu

Reward sensitivity, affective neuroscience personality, symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and *TPH2*-703G/T (rs4570625) genotype

Aleksander Pulver[1], Evelyn Kiive[2] and Jaanus Harro[1,3]

[1]School of Natural Sciences and Health, Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia; [2]Division of Special Education, Department of Education, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia and [3]Division of Neuropsychopharmacology, Department of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

Original Article

Cite this article: Pulver A, Kiive E, and Harro J. (2020) Reward sensitivity, affective neuroscience personality, symptoms of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and *TPH2*-703G/T (rs4570625) genotype. *Acta Neuropsychiatrica* **32:**247–256. doi: 10.1017/neu.2020.18

Received: 5 January 2020
Revised: 15 April 2020
Accepted: 21 April 2020
First published online: 27 April 2020

Key words:
reward; attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder; emotions; serotonin; tryptophan hydroxylase

Author for correspondence:
Jaanus Harro, Email: Jaanus.Harro@ut.ee

Abstract

Objective: Reward sensitivity is an increasingly used construct in psychiatry, yet its possible inner structure and relationship with other affective variables are not well known. *Methods:* A reward sensitivity measurement scale was constructed on the basis of large item pool collected from birth cohort representative samples (the Estonian Children Personality Behaviour and Health Study; original $n = 1238$). Affective Neuroscience Personality Scale (ANPS) and the Adult Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) Self-Report Scale (ASRS) were administered in young adulthood. A variant (rs4570625) of the gene encoding tryptophan hydroxylase 2 (*TPH2*) that is responsible for the synthesis of central serotonin was genotyped. *Results:* Reward sensitivity consisted of two orthogonal components, operationally defined as Openness to Rewards and Insatiability by Reward, that respectively characterise the striving towards multiple rewards and the strong pursuit and fixation to a particular reward. While SEEKING and PLAY (and to lower extent CARE) of the ANPS co-varied with Openness to Rewards, FEAR, SADNESS, and ANGER were related to Insatiability by Reward. The total score of ASRS was moderately correlated with Insatiability by Reward, while the association with Openness to Rewards was negligible. However, ASRS Inattention had some negative relationship with the Social Experience facet of Openness to Rewards. The T/T homozygotes for the *TPH2* promoter polymorphism had lower Insatiability by Reward but not Openness to Rewards. *Conclusions:* Behaviours sensitive to rewards are separable to the components of variability and fixation, and these components are differentially related to affective aspects of personality, attention, and hyperactivity as well as to *TPH2* genotype.

Significant outcomes

- Reward sensitivity can be parsed into striving towards multiple rewards and fixation to a specific reward.
- Openness to Rewards and Insatiability by Reward sensitivity have distinct relationship with personality traits and ADHD symptoms.
- The *TPH2* promoter polymorphism was associated specifically with Insatiability by Reward.

Limitations

- The reward sensitivity instrument was developed *post hoc*, applied in a Fennic language and requires further development and characterisation together with related instruments.
- While the sample was reasonably large, and birth cohort representative, the association of *TPH2* genotype and reward sensitivity remains to be independently replicated.

Introduction

Reinforcement sensitivity theory (RST) has been stated to occupy a unique space in literature as a strong basic construct of temperament (Corr, 2009; Gray and McNaughton, 2000; Walker *et al.*, 2017). In describing the principal brain mechanisms behind animal and human behaviour, the Gray's RST (Gray, 1994) is arguably the most important theoretical approach to explain individual differences, via the reward and punishment sensitivities (e.g. Collins *et al.*, 2017). The behavioural predictions of RST have been examined across a broad range of areas, including psychopathy (e.g. Broerman *et al.*, 2014; De Pascalis *et al.*, 2019), criminal behaviour (e.g. Arnett

and Newman, 2000; Leue *et al.,* 2008), forgiveness (e.g. Johnson *et al.,* 2010), substance abuse (e.g. Derefinko *et al.*, 2016; Papinczak *et al.,* 2018), and there is considerable empirical evidence supporting the main tenets of RST (e.g. Bijttebier *et al.,* 2009; Gaher *et al.,* 2015; Meis *et al.,* 2017). Three functionally independent motivational subsystems comprise RST: the behavioural approach system (BAS), the fight/flight/freeze system (FFFS), and the behavioural inhibition system (BIS) (Gray and McNaughton, 2000; Corr, 2009; Collins *et al.,* 2017).

In Gray's theory, a psychobiological trait, called sensitivity to reward or reward sensitivity, reflects the functional outcomes of the activity in the BAS (Gray, 1994). Growing evidence suggests that in particular reward sensitivity is associated with important behavioural choices that have major implications to health, such as excessive consumption of palatable foods and use of addictive substances (Emery and Simons, 2017; Joyner *et al.,* 2019; Tatnell *et al.,* 2019); it has also been found to predict recurrence of manic episodes in bipolar disorder (Kwan *et al.,* 2020). In contrast, low reward sensitivity can predict symptoms of depression (Hausman *et al.,* 2018). Generally, reward sensitivity as the component of temperament and personality encompasses individual differences in the tendency to detect, pursue, and derive pleasure from positive stimuli (Gray and McNaughton, 2000; Corr, 2009). The BAS is primarily organised around pathways using the neurotransmitter dopamine and can be defined as the tendency to engage in motivated approach behaviour in the presence of rewarding stimuli (Gray and McNaughton, 2000; DeYoung, 2013).

Typically reward sensitivity has been measured by the Carver & White BIS/BAS Scales (Carver and White, 1994) and, more recently, also by The Jackson 5 (J5; Jackson, 2009), Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory Personality Questionnaire (RST-PQ; Corr and Cooper, 2016), or the Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire (SPSRQ; Torrubia *et al.,* 2001). In recent years, careful analysis of the existing questionnaires has suggested that some significant theoretical and operational limitations exist (Corr and Cooper, 2016). It has been argued that the process of scale construction has not strongly adhered to the theoretical postulates of the RST, and as a result, the construct validity of the available questionnaires may be suboptimal. Either have the instruments defined reward sensitivity as a homogenous construct, while the case can be made that it is multidimensional (e.g. Corr, 2016), or introduced components that should not be taken as synonymous to reward sensitivity, such as impulsivity or goal directedness.

Rewards constitute a major incentive in the balance between approach and avoidance, and the sensitivity to rewards should have implications to other fundamental mechanisms guiding behaviour such as basic emotions (e.g. Collins *et al.,* 2017; Lahvis, 2017; Montag *et al.,* 2017). Nevertheless, no investigation has examined the relationship of reward sensitivity to the traits as measured by the Affective Neuroscience Personality Scale (ANPS; Davis *et al.,* 2003; Davis and Panksepp, 2011) which has been constructed bottom up to study traits predicted by the basic neuroscience research in animals (Panksepp, 1998; Montag and Panksepp, 2017). Nearly all seven proposed basic emotive systems characterised by the ANPS include brain regions that have been suggested to contribute to reward sensitivity (Panksepp, 2016). Reward sensitivity has also been strongly related to the brain areas highlighted in studies on Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) (e.g. Avila *et al.,* 2008; Holroyd *et al.,* 2008; Hahn *et al.,* 2014; Adrián-Ventura *et al.,* 2019; Luo *et al.,* 2019). ADHD patients are reported to have higher scores of affective temperaments and difficulties with regulation of behaviour directed towards rewards (e.g. Torrente *et al.,* 2017), and reward sensitivity could be considered an endophenotype of ADHD.

While much of reward sensitivity research has paid attention to the role of dopamine neurons, the function of serotonergic neurotransmission is also crucial (Fletcher *et al.,* 1995; Bari *et al.,* 2010). Transient activation of dorsal raphe elicits strong reinforcement signals, but 5-HT neurons of dorsal raphe enhance reward waiting (Luo *et al.,* 2015). These neurons also change their tonic firing rates across trials of reward and punishment, suggestive of signalling on multiple timescales (Cohen *et al.,* 2015). Of the genetic variants shaping the individual differences in the serotonergic system, the serotonin transporter promoter polymorphism has been associated with reward responses in environmentally sensitive manner (Richards *et al.,* 2016), and the composite of risk alleles of three serotonin-related genes was associated with BAS scores (Pearson *et al.,* 2014). Levels of serotonin in the central nervous system (CNS) depend on the activity of tryptophan hydroxylase 2, the rate-limiting enzyme of the synthesis of serotonin. The −703 G/T polymorphism of the *TPH2* gene (rs4570625) has been associated with amygdalar responsiveness (Brown *et al.,* 2005; Canli *et al.,* 2005), risk of affective disorder (Gao *et al.,* 2012), and with behavioural inhibition (Latsko *et al.,* 2016). This genotype is associated with functional connectivity (Tao *et al.*, 2018) and white matter integrity (Ping *et al.,* 2019) in the brain. A recent systematic review and meta-analysis concluded that the *TPH2* rs4570625 polymorphism is significantly associated with psychiatric disorders such as unipolar depression, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, and suicide (Ottenhof *et al.,* 2018). The risk allele has been the major, G-allele, and the well-powered studies and meta-analysis have pointed at a much larger effect if the risk allele carriers are compared to the T/T-homozygotes. The experimental studies have, however, usually compared G/G homozygotes to T-allele carriers, owing to the low frequency of the minor T allele.

It thus appears that the minor T-allele, especially in homozygotes, is protective against a variety of mental health disorders, but the mediating mechanisms are not known. In our studies on representative birth cohort samples, the G/G homozygotes and G/T heterozygotes have appeared similar in many respects, but a rather large distinction of T/T homozygotes has been apparent with regard to lower neuroticism, higher extraversion, and higher conscientiousness (Lehto *et al.,* 2015) as well as low aggressiveness, depressiveness, and trait anxiety (Laas *et al.,* 2017). The strikingly low aggressiveness in the male *TPH2* rs4570625 T/T homozygotes, both during the years at school and later in adult life, however, remained unexplained by anxiety. Owing to the role of serotonin in the control of aggressive urges (Miczek *et al.,* 1989; Harro and Oreland, 2016) and the relationship between pursuits of aggression as reward (Golden *et al.,* 2017), it is, however, plausible that the relationship between *TPH2* genetic variation and aggression could involve reward sensitivity.

The first aim of the present study was to identify common items for operational measurement of reward sensitivity and to explore for any emerging factor structure. The second purpose was to analyse the associations of the obtained reward sensitivity construct with the ANPS, presence of symptoms of ADHD, and with the *TPH2* genotype.

Material and methods

Sample

This study was carried out on the Estonian sample of the European Youth Heart Study (1998/1999), which was subsequently

https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18 Published online by Cambridge University Press

incorporated into the longitudinal Estonian Children Personality Behaviour and Health Study (ECPBHS). The European Youth Heart Study sample of the ECPBHS consists of two birth cohorts. The rationale and procedure of sample formation, and further data collection waves have been described elsewhere in detail (Harro *et al.,* 2001; Tomson-Johanson *et al.,* 2020). ECPBHS is highly representative of two birth cohorts of a local population, as 79% of subjects of the randomised regional sample participated in the original data collection. All the subjects are of European descent. Data collection has been conducted at ages 9 (only the younger cohort), 15, 18, 25, and 33 (only the older cohort). Data used in the present analyses were collected at age 25 or, if not available for age 25, then from the study wave at age 33. The original size of the total sample is $n = 1238$, but all data necessary for the analyses presented in this paper were $n = 811$ to 824. This study was approved by the Ethics Review Committee on Human Research of the University of Tartu, and written informed consent was obtained from all the participants and in case of minors also from their parents.

Reward Openness and Insatiability Scale

The Reward Openness and Insatiability Scale (ROIS) that is used in this manuscript to measure reward sensitivity was constructed *post hoc* making use of previously collected information on personality. Three experienced behavioural scientists independently extracted items thought to reflect reward sensitivity from the Estonian versions of International Personality Item Pool NEO (IPIP) (Goldberg, 1999; Mõttus *et al.,* 2006), Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS-11; Patton *et al.,* 1995; Akkermann *et al.,* 2010), the brief version of the ANPS (Davis *et al.,* 2003; Harro *et al.,* 2019), Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Spielberger *et al.,* 1983; Akkermann *et al.,* 2010), and Adaptive and Maladaptive Impulsivity Scale (AMIS) (Paaver *et al.,* 2006; Tomson-Johanson *et al.,* 2020). The extracted items were discussed, and an initial pool of items was formed with consensus. This item pool consisted of 69 items: 11 items from BIS-11, 13 items from ANPS, 9 items from AMIS, 2 items from STAI, and 34 items from IPIP. The *z*-value transformation for responses of the items was performed before the statistical analysis.

In order to explore preliminary factor structure of the eventual reward sensitivity instrument, principal component analysis (PCA) with Direct Oblimin rotation (delta = 0) was carried out on all 69 items. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy value was 0.84 which indicates that the sample was adequate for factor analysis. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(2346) = 7332.14$, $p < 0.0001$, indicating that factor analysis was appropriate for this data. To determine the number of factors to extract, both the scree plot and eigenvalues were considered. The scree plot indicated that the data best fit a two-factor or four-factor solution. The eigenvalues of the first two components were 7.551 (accounted for 10.94% of total variance) and 7.083 (accounted for 10.27% of total variance), respectively. The next two components had eigenvalues 2.758 (accounted for 4.00% of total variance) and 2.532 (accounted for 3.67% of total variance), respectively. The communalities of items were from 0.035 to 0.539.

Affective Neuroscience Personality Scale

We used the adaptation (Harro *et al.,* 2019) of the short version of the ANPS (Davis *et al.,* 2003) that is a self-report instrument constructed bottom up to correspond to the activity in neural circuits underlying basic emotive systems as defined in animal research (Panksepp, 1998; Davis and Panksepp, 2011). It comprises scales termed ANGER, FEAR, SADNESS, SEEKING, CARE, and PLAY, each measured with six items, each on a 5-point scale. Data on ANPS were available for 423 subjects in the ECPBHS younger cohort and 502 subjects in the older cohort.

Measures of ADHD symptoms

Subjects filled in the Estonian version of the World Health Organization Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS) symptom checklist (Kessler *et al.,* 2005; Kiive and Harro, 2013; Kiive *et al.,* 2014), an instrument composed of 18 questions based on Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition (DSM-IV) criteria of ADHD. The ASRS consists of nine items that represent symptoms related to inattention and nine items assessing symptoms of hyperactivity/impulsivity. Each of the items is scored on a five-point Likert rating scale with 0 = "never," 1 = "rarely," 2 = "sometimes," 3 = "often," and 4 = "very often" based on the participant's experiences over the last 6 months. Six of the 18 questions most predictive of symptoms consistent with ADHD (Kessler *et al.,* 2005) are the basis for the ASRS Screen ($M = 1.37$, SD = 0.59, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.68$). The total score is calculated by summing the values of all items ($M = 1.30$, SD = 0.50, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.86$). The higher the score is the more symptoms are pronounced. In addition to the sum score, the two subscales Inattention ($M = 1.42$, SD = 0.55, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.80$) and Hyperactivity/Impulsivity ($M = 1.18$, SD = 0.59, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.80$) are calculated.

TPH2 rs4570625 genotyping

Genomic DNA was extracted from whole blood samples using Qiagen QIAamp® DNA Blood Midi Kit. Genotyping for *TPH2* G-703 T (rs4570625) was performed as previously described (Lehto *et al.,* 2015) with the Applied Biosystems ViiA™ 7 Real-Time PCR System using the TaqMan® Pre-Designed SNP Genotyping Assay with Solis BioDyne 5 × HOT FIREPol® Probe qPCR Mix Plus (ROX). All DNA samples of the ECPBHS ($n = 1234$) were successfully genotyped. In total, the sample included 749 G/G homozygotes (60.7%), 432 G/T heterozygotes (35.0%), and 53 T/T homozygotes (4.3%). Minor allele frequency was 0.22. The genotype frequencies were in Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (chi-squared 0.887; expected frequencies 61.2, 34.1, and 4.7%, respectively).

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out using SPSS v. 18 software. Correlations between test scores were assessed by Pearson correlation, and assessment of factor structure of the new reward sensitivity scale was carried out by PCA with oblique rotation. In order to analyse the association of scales of ROIS and the modules of ANPS or ADHD, multiple linear regression analysis was the carried out. Hierarchical cluster analysis (cluster method: between-groups linkage, measure: Peason correlation) was used for analysis of structure of correlation pattern between modules of ANPS and subscales of ROIS. Hierarchical cluster analysis is typically applied with an eye to determining how n entities – objects, scales, sentences, subjects, etc. – can be grouped into $m < n$ clusters that exhibit high within-group similarity and low similarity to other groups (e.g. King, 2015) and better reveal the general pattern of associations between the psychological constructs. While the relationship of ROIS and ANPS was examined, the ANPS-derived items were omitted from ROIS data. Owing to dissimilar groups sizes, ROIS

https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18 Published online by Cambridge University Press



Fig. 1. Items of the Reward Openness and Insatiability Scale loading on the higher-order factors Insatiablity by Reward and Openness to Rewards. Principal component analysis with oblique rotation (Direct Oblimin).

test scores in *TPH2* genotype groups were assessed by both non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA); since the results were similar the latter with *post hoc* comparisons by Tamhane's T2 tests is described in Results. Before statistical analysis for all the scales, the mean item score was computed (i.e. sum of the items is divided by number of items in scale). In the statistical analysis, the conventional 5% level was used to assess the significance.

Results

Structure of the ROIS

Out of the initial item pool, 28 items were selected on the basis of factor loadings, communalities, and internal homogeneity and included in a new factor analysis (PCA, Direct Oblimin rotation, delta = 0). The KMO measure of sampling adequacy value was 0.86 which indicated that the dateset was appropriate for factor analysis. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(378) = 7095.7$, $p < 0.0001$, also indicating that factor analysis was appropriate for these data. The scree plot revealed a clear factor structure with the four factors accounting for 46.4% of the total variance. The communalities of items were from 0.200 to 0.620. The four factors explained 18.2%, 15.5%, 6.5%, and 6.2% of the variance, respectively, and factor loadings were, respectively, between 0.504 and 0.775, 0.514 and 0.720, 0.360 and 0.805, and 0.503 and 0.695.

The component correlation matrix demonstrated two factors (Factor 1 and Factor 4) in a positive correlation $r = 0.40$, as well as the two other factors (Factor 2 and Factor 3; $r = 0.31$). Such a pattern of correlations indicates the hierarchical structure of the test, so there are two second-order factors and four first-order factors. Fig. 1 provides illustration of all 28 items located in two-dimensional factor space. Content of included items translated into English, their factor loadings, and the sources where analogous items have been used are available in Supplementary Table 1.

Close inspection of items of Factor 1 reveals this factor as related to impulsive buying and excessive spending (sample Cronbach $\alpha = 0.85$), so it was named *Excessive spending* subscale. The items of Factor 4 are related to low self-control and troubles in resisting to temptations (sample Cronbach $\alpha = 0.77$). This subscale was named *Giving in to cravings*. These two subscales together characterise the excessive fixation to a particular reward, the higher-order factor thus representing *Insatiability by Reward* (sample Cronbach $\alpha = 0.86$). Factor 2 has been labelled *Excitement and Novelty* subscale owing to its reflection of seeking of new experiences and excitement (sample Cronbach $\alpha = 0\,0.79$). The items of Factor 3 are largely associated with sociability and social exchange (sample Cronbach $\alpha = 0.75$), so named *Social experiences* subscale. These two subscales characterise the striving towards multiplicity of rewards, so the higher-order factor has been labelled *Openness to Rewards* (sample Cronbach $\alpha = 0.82$). Correlation between scores of Openness to Rewards and Insatiability by Reward was statistically insignificant $r = -0.008$ ($p = 0.82$, $N = 818$). Thus, these two reward sensitivity factors are orthogonal, as reflected in item loadings in Fig. 1.

Relationship between subscales of the ROIS and factors of the ANPS

Cluster analysis (between-groups linkage method, Peason correlation measure) of the scales of ROIS and personality factors of ANPS reveals two clearly separate groupings (Fig. 2). This pattern of associations is also observed in zero-order correlations (Table 1). Openness to Rewards was strongly associated with SEEKING and PLAY, and rather weakly with CARE; weak negative correlations were found with FEAR and SADNESS; and no relationship to ANGER. Insatiability by Reward was, instead, in moderate positive correlation with SADNESS, FEAR, and ANGER, had no relationship with SEEKING or CARE, and very weak but negative correlation with PLAY.

Relationship of ADHD symptoms with the ROIS and ANPS

Zero-order pair-wise correlations between scales and subscales of ROIS and ADHD measures show a clear pattern of Insatiability by

https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. Pearson correlations between the subscales of the Reward Openness and Insatiability Scale (ROIS) and Affective Neuroscience Personality Scale (ANPS). Mean item scores ± standard deviations are presented in brackets ($n = 815$)

	ROIS					
ANPS	OR_Excitement and Novelty (3.66 ± 0.66)	OR_Social experience (3.33 ± 0.85)	IR_Excessive spending (2.46 ± 0.82)	IR_Giving in to cravings (2.64 ± 0.69)	Openness to Rewards (3.53 ± 0.61)	Insatiability by Reward (2.55 ± 0.65)
ANGER (2.76 ± 0.76)	0.05	0.07*	0.22**	0.37**	0.07	0.34**
SADNESS (2.76 ± 0.78)	−0.09*	−0.22**	0.31**	0.40**	−0.18**	0.41**
FEAR (2.70 ± 0.73)	−0.17**	−0.19**	0.23**	0.40**	−0.22**	0.36**
CARE (3.62 ± 0.65)	0.05	0.23**	0.01	−0.04	0.16**	−0.02
PLAY (3.73 ± 0.68)	0.42**	0.46**	−0.05	−0.09*	0.53**	−0.08*
SEEKING (3.83 ± 0.60)	0.57**	0.39**	−0.04	−0.01	0.59**	−0.03

OR – Openness to Rewards, IR – Insatiability by Reward. Means ± standard deviations are presented in brackets. ROIS scores exclude the items from ANPS in this analysis. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$.



Fig. 2. Dendrogram of cluster analysis of the subscales of Reward Openness and Insatiability Scale (ROIS) and dimensions of the Affective Neuroscience Personality Scale (ANPS). Hierarchical cluster analysis with between-groups linkage method and Peason correlation measure. Note: ROIS items from ANPS excluded from this analysis.

Reward positively correlated with the ADHD symptoms as measured with the ASRS scales (Table 2), whereas Openness to Rewards correlated very weakly with either inattention or hyperactivity, these weak correlations also being in opposite to each other direction. Multiple regression was performed to clarify the impact of aspects of reward sensitivity and the personality factors of ANPS on ADHD symptoms. The two components of Insatiability by Reward were the major and universal predictors of ADHD symptoms, but the Excitement and Novelty aspect of Openness to Rewards not at all (Table 3). Social experience contributed to Inattention but not to Hyperactivity/Impulsivity. As to the Affective Neuroscience Personality Model, ANGER was related to ADHD Hyperactivity/Impulsivity, but not to Inattention. SADNESS and FEAR had some positive association with either component of ASRS, whereas which association was stronger, did not coincide. CARE had some association with Inattention which was negative. SEEKING was in strong positive association with both aspects of ADHD symptoms, while PLAY had relationship with neither.

THP2 -703 G/T genotype and ROIS

There was no statistically significant difference in Openness to Rewards between the *TPH2* genotype groups [$F(2, 821) = 0.96$; $p = 0.384$, $F(2, 821) = 0.41$; $p = 0.667$, and $F(2, 821) = 1.01$; $p = 0.364$ for the total score, Excitement and Novelty subscale, and Social experiences subscale, respectively; Table 4]. However, siginificant differences were found in Insatiability by Reward [$F(2, 814) = 6.08$; $p = 0.002$] as well as the Excessive spending [$F(2, 814) = 6.06$; $p = 0.002$] and Giving in to cravings [$F(2, 814) = 3.18$; $p = 0.042$] subscale. While the scores of G/G and G/T genotypes were similar, the T/T homozygotes had much lower scores.

Discussion

In this study, we have found evidence to suggest that reward sensitivity is comprising of two rather independent components that, respectively, characterise striving to and preference of multiple rewards versus strong fixation on a particular reward. This has

https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2. Pearson correlations between the Reward Openness and Insatiability Scale (ROIS) and Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS)

	OR_Excitement and Novelty	OR_Social experience	IR_Excessive spending	IR_Giving in to cravings	Openness to Rewards	Insatiability by Reward	ASRS Screen test	ASRS Inattention	ASRS Hyperactivity/ Impulsivity
OR_Social experience	0.45**								
IR_Excessive spending	0.03	0.01							
IR_Giving in to cravings	−0.01	−0.05	0.48**						
Openness to Rewards	0.84**	0.86**	0.02	−0.04					
Insatiability by Reward	0.01	−0.03	0.89**	0.83**	−0.01				
ASRS Screen test	0.07*	−0.09**	0.34**	0.39**	−0.20	0.42**			
ASRS Inattention	0.02	−0.20**	0.31**	0.39**	−0.11**	0.40**	0.84**		
ASRS Hyperactivity/ Impulsivity	0.11**	−0.05	0.29**	0.42**	0.09**	0.40**	0.69**	0.56**	
ASRS Total score	0.07*	−0.08*	0.34**	0.46**	−0.01	0.46**	0.86**	0.87**	0.89**

OR - Openness to Rewards, IR – Insatiability by Reward scale ($n = 811$).
* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$.

not been described previously, possibly owing to the limitations of the existing questionnaires that may have somewhat deviated from the theoretical postulates of the RST or attempted to establish reward sensitivity as a homogenous construct (Corr and Cooper, 2016; Corr, 2016). Being in possession of the large item pool collected from a large, birth cohort representative sample to whom any recognised reward sensitivity instrument had not been administered, we have made an exploratory attempt to examine the internal structure of reward sensitivity. ECPBHS offers the advantage of a database comprising a variety of behavioural items, thus we compiled *post hoc* an instrument for the measurement of reward sensitivity. This approach has yielded an instrument with two orthogonal dimensions that make intuitive sense, but will require further formal development and rigorous studies to ascertain its applicability.

We selected as the next goal to reveal the relationship of reward sensitivity, as measured with the ROIS, with personality in the affective neuroscience model (Panksepp, 2016). Empirical studies addressing the position of reward sensitivity in the framework of the Five Factor Model of personality mostly have shown that reward sensitivity is positively associated with Extraversion and negatively with Neuroticism (e.g. Keiser and Ross, 2011; Segarra *et al.,* 2014; Smillie and Wacker , 2014; Corr and Cooper, 2016; Smillie *et al.,* 2019). The ANPS has, in contrast to lexical approaches to the structure of personality, been constructed bottom-up to measure personality as revealed in expression on primary emotion systems, defined by neurobiological studies across mammalian species (Panksepp, 1998). ANPS facets distinctly correlate with measures of white matter integrity in polydrug abusers (Unterrainer *et al.,* 2017), a subject group with likely deviations in reward sensitivity. Recently, problematic use of internet and smartphone addiction were associated with high expression of FEAR and SADNESS, and to a lesser extent ANGER, and to low levels of CARE, PLAY, and SEEKING (Montag *et al.,* 2016). Interestingly, the two reward sensitivity component ROIS clearly differentiated these personality facets so that Insatiability by Reward was associated with ANGER, FEAR, and SADNESS, while Openness to Rewards was, instead, related to SEEKING, PLAY, and CARE. (In relevant analyses, the ANPS-derived items were omitted from ROIS data.) Hierarchical cluster analysis revealed that both facets of Insatiability by Reward were related to the three neuroticism-related ANPS traits with high similarity. The two facets of Openness to Rewards had, however, specific relationship with ANPS traits, so that Excitement and Novelty were more close related to SEEKING than to Social Experience, and the latter was more closely related to PLAY. Of note is the complete absence of association between SEEKING and Insatiability by Reward. This was unexpected because the bottom-up construct of SEEKING was made bearing in mind what is known of dopaminergic control of reward-related behaviour (Panksepp, 1998; Montag and Panksepp, 2017). Direct evidence for a relationship of SEEKING with dopaminergic system and reward-related behaviour in humans is, however, not available, therefore any neurobiological interpretation of this dissociation at present remains speculative. It is nevertheless conceivable that while the mesotelencephalic dopaminergic neurotransmission is vital for search of multiple rewards, it does not contribute to the insatiability aspect of reward sensitivity. It was recently demonstrated that reward-related firing of the ventral tegmental (VTA) dopamine neurons and dopamine release in the nucleus accumbens can be dissociated so that in conditions of orientation towards rewards there is a coupling while the immediate motivated behaviour is associated with dopamine release but not VTA activity (Mohebi *et al.,* 2019). The former must hence be regulated locally, possibly via inhibition of the tonic action of serotonin on the 5-HT_{2C} receptors (Dremencov *et al.,* 2005).

Higher scores of SEEKING and SADNESS predicted both components of ADHD symptomatology, higher Inattention, and Hyperactivity/Impulsivity. A higher score of ANGER was associated with higher Hyperactivity/Impulsivity, while FEAR contributed to Inattention. Also, the score of Inattention was negatively associated with CARE dimension. Similarly, a recent study of Wernicke *et al.* (2019) has found a higher negative emotionality, namely, ANGER, FEAR, and SADNESS, significantly associated with more inattentive, hyperactive/impulsive tendencies of young adults (Wernicke *et al.,* 2019).

https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 3. Multiple regression models for Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS) subscores ($n = 811$)

	B	St. error	Beta	*t*	Sig	*F*	df	*p*	R	Adj R^2
ASRS Screen test						27.09	10 810	<0.0001	0.50	0.24
OR_ Excitement and Novelty	0.07	0.04	0.07	1.90	0.32					
OR_Social experience	−0.09	0.03	−0.13	−3.38	0.001					
IR_Excessive spending	0.12	0.03	0.17	4.77	<0.0001					
IR_Giving in to cravings	0.17	0.03	0.20	5.17	<0.0001					
ANGER	0.08	0.03	0.10	2.64	0.009					
SADNESS	0.10	0.03	0.13	3.03	0.002					
FEAR	0.05	0.04	0.06	1.40	0.16					
CARE	−0.05	0.03	−0.06	−1.73	0.09					
PLAY	−0.01	0.03	−0.01	−0.17	0.87					
SEEKING	0.13	0.04	0.13	3.14	0.002					
Inattention						31.00	10 810	<0.0001	0.53	0.27
OR_ Excitement and Novelty	0.06	0.03	0.07	1.89	0.09					
OR_Social experience	−0.13	0.02	−0.20	−5.48	<0.0001					
IR_Excessive spending	0.09	0.02	0.14	3.90	<0.0001					
IR_Giving in to cravings	0.17	0.03	0.22	5.76	<0.0001					
ANGER	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.58	0.56					
SADNESS	0.07	0.03	0.10	2.41	0.02					
FEAR	0.11	0.03	0.14	3.41	0.001					
CARE	−0.06	0.03	−0.08	−2.53	0.02					
PLAY	−0.04	0.03	−0.05	−1.27	0.21					
SEEKING	0.14	0.04	0.15	3.81	<0.0001					
Hyperactivity/Impulsivity						34.01	10 810	<0.0001	0.55	0.29
OR_ Excitement and Novelty	−0.00	0.03	−0.00	−0.07	0.94					
OR_Social experience	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.90	0.37					
IR_Excessive spending	0.06	0.03	0.09	2.47	0.01					
IR_Giving in to cravings	0.20	0.03	0.23	6.31	<0.0001					
ANGER	0.14	0.03	0.18	4.88	<0.0001					
SADNESS	0.10	0.03	0.13	3.33	0.001					
FEAR	0.06	0.03	0.08	1.85	0.06					
CARE	−0.03	0.03	−0.03	−1.10	0.27					
PLAY	−0.02	0.03	−0.02	−0.50	0.62					
SEEKING	0.21	0.04	0.21	5.47	<0.0001					
ASRS Total score						41.08	10 810	<0.0001	0.58	0.33
OR_ Excitement and Novelty	0.03	0.03	0.04	1.03	0.30					
OR_Social experience	−0.06	0.02	−0.09	−2.58	0.01					
IR_Excessive spending	0.08	0.02	0.12	3.71	<0.0001					
IR_Giving in to cravings	0.19	0.03	0.25	7.10	<0.0001					
ANGER	0.08	0.02	0.11	3.29	0.001					
SADNESS	0.09	0.03	0.13	3.39	0.001					
FEAR	0.09	0.03	0.12	3.06	0.002					
CARE	−0.05	0.03	−0.06	−2.00	0.04					
PLAY	−0.03	0.03	−0.04	−1.02	0.31					
SEEKING	0.18	0.03	0.21	5.48	<0.0001					

https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 4. TPH2 effects on reward sensitivity (ROIS subscales) group mean item scores and standard errors and multiple comparisons *p*-value (Tamhane's)

ROIS subscale	TPH2 G/G genotype	TPH2 G/T genotype	TPH2 T/T genotype
OR_Excitement and Novelty	3.70 ± 0.03, $n = 501$	3.70 ± 0.04, $n = 286$	3.80 ± 0.11, $n = 37$
OR_Social experience	3.58 ± 0.03, $n = 501$	3.58 ± 0.04, $n = 286$	3.74 ± 0.09, $n = 37$
IR_Excessive spending	2.47 ± 0.04, $n = 497$	2.50 ± 0.05, $n = 283$	2.00 ± 0.09, $n = 37$**
IR_Giving in to cravings	2.66 ± 0.03, $n = 497$	2.64 ± 0.04, $n = 283$	2.36 ± 0.10, $n = 37$*
Openness to Rewards	3.64 ± 0.03, $n = 501$	3.64 ± 0.03, $n = 286$	3.77 ± 0.09, $n = 37$
Insatiability by Reward	2.56 ± 0.03, $n = 497$	2.57 ± 0.04, $n = 283$	2.18 ± 0.07, $n = 37$**

OR – Openness to Rewards, IR – Insatiability by Reward.
* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.0001$ significant difference of the *TPH2* T/T homozygotes from G/G homozygotes as well as G/T heterozygotes.

Higher scores of the Insatiability by Reward, SEEKING, ANGER SADNESS, and FEAR predicted more severe symptoms of ADHD, while the scores of Social experience and CARE were negatively associated with ADHD symptoms. ADHD individuals are well known by their increased preference for small immediate rewards rather than large delayed ones (Marx *et al.,* 2018) and preference of risky decisions (Luman *et al.,* 2008). Excessive spending and giving in to cravings are also associated with poor impulse control. On the other hand, in our study, the score of Social experience subscale was negatively associated with ADHD symptoms, which supports the notion that sensation/experience seeking and impulsivity are dissociable constructs and based on partially distinct neurobiological substrates.

The *TPH2*-703 G/T polymorphism also distinguished Openness to Rewards and Insatiability by Reward in terms of being associated only with the latter. While the functional significance of this polymorphism at the cellular level requires further investigation, the T-allele may relate to hyperfunction of tryptophan hydroxylase (Lin *et al.,* 2007; Chen *et al.,* 2008), and if this were the case, serotonin levels should be particularly high in the T/T homozygotes. This would be well compatible with low aggressiveness, anxiety, and depressiveness. We could observe hardly any effect of the single T-allele, and this is compatible with recent studies on psychiatric patients (see Introduction for references) and with our previous findings on personality, aggressiveness, and anxiety in the ECPBHS sample (Lehto *et al.,* 2015; Laas *et al.,* 2017). Somewhat speculatively, the minor effect of a single T-allele may be caused by the efficient compensatory mechanisms in the synthesis of 5-HT as demonstrated in animal experiments (Kriegebaum *et al.,* 2010).

An obvious limitation of this study lies in the current infeasibility of validation by other reward sensitivity instruments because of the database approach. On the other hand, the latter has the advantage of diverse, population-representative sample tested in uniform, laboratory conditions. Further studies should establish a novel instrument corresponding to the inner structure of reward sensitivity as revealed in the present investigation and compare the ROIS with other instruments and behavioural tests to validate the concept of the separable components of reward sensitivity. Owing to the often poor replicability of findings with candidate gene variants, the association of the *TPH2* gene with reward sensitivity requires testing in other populations.

Conclusively, striving towards multiple rewards and strong fixation on a particular reward were distinguished with a novel instrument and demonstrated to have distinct association with affective neuroscience personality and ADHD-like traits, as well as with the genotype of tryptophan hydroxylase 2, the rate-limiting enzyme for serotonin synthesis in the brain.

Supplementary material. To view supplementary material for this article, please visit https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to the ECPBHS study participants, their parents, and the whole ECPBHS team.

Author contributions. The authors JH, EK, and AP contributed to the design of the study and data collection, literature searches, statistical analysis, and writing of the manuscript. All authors have approved the final manuscript.

Financial support. This work was supported by Estonian Research Council Project IUT20-40, the EC Horizon 2020 project CoCA (H2020-PHC-2015-667302), and the Tallinn University ASTRA project TU TEE financed by the European Union European Regional Development Fund (2014-2020.4.01.16-0033).

Conflict of Interest. None.

Ethical standards. The authors assert that all procedures contributing to this work comply with the ethical standards of the relevant national and institutional committees on human experimentation and with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 2008.

References

Adrián-Ventura J, Costumero V, Parcet MA and Ávila C (2019) Linking personality and brain anatomy: a structural MRI approach to reinforcement sensitivity theory. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience* **14**(3), 329–338.

Akkermann K, Nordquist N, Oreland L and Harro J (2010) Serotonin transporter gene promoter polymorphism affects the severity of binge eating in general population. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* **34**(1), 111–114.

Arnett PA and Newman JP (2000) Gray's three-arousal model: an empirical investigation. *Personality and Individual Differences* **28**(6), 1171–1189.

Avila C, Parcet MA and Barro's-Loscertales A (2008) A cognitive neuroscience approach to individual differences in sensitivity to reward. *Neurotoxicity Research* **14**(2–3), 191–203.

Bari A, Theobald DE, Caprioli D, Mar AC, Aidoo-Micah A, Dalley JW and Robbins TW (2010) Serotonin modulates sensitivity to reward and negative feedback in a probabilistic reversal learning task in rats. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **35**(6), 1290–1301.

Bijttebier P, Beck I, Claes L and Vandereycken W (2009) Gray's reinforcement sensitivity theory as a framework for research on personality–psychopathology associations. *Clinical Psychology Review* **29**(5), 421–430.

Broerman RL, Ross SR and Corr PJ (2014) Throwing more light on the dark side of psychopathy: an extension of previous findings for the revised reinforcement sensitivity theory. *Personality and Individual Differences* **68**, 165–169.

Brown SM, Peet E, Manuck SB, Williamson DE, Dahl RE, Ferrell RE and Hariri AR. (2005) A regulatory variant of the human tryptophan hydroxylase-2 gene biases amygdala reactivity. *Molecular Psychiatry* **10**(9), 884–888.

Canli T, Congdon E, Gutknecht L, Constable RT and Lesch KP (2005) Amygdala responsiveness is modulated by tryptophan hydroxylase-2 gene variation. *Journal of Neural Transmission* **112**(11), 1479–1485.

Carver CS and White TL (1994) Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: the BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **67**(2), 319–333.

Chen GL, Vallender EJ and Miller GM (2008) Functional characterization of the human *TPH2* 5' regulatory region: untranslated region and polymorphisms modulate gene expression in vitro. *Human Genetics* **122**(6), 645–657.

Cohen JY, Amoroso MW and Uchida N (2015) Serotonergic neurons signal reward and punishment on multiple timescales. *eLife* **25**, 4. doi: 10.7554/eLife.06346 (https://elifesciences.org/articles/06346).

Collins MD, Jackson CJ, Walker BR, O'Connor PJ and Gardiner E (2017) Integrating the context-appropriate balanced attention model and reinforcement sensitivity theory: towards a domain-general personality process model. *Psychology Bulletin* **143**(1), 91–106.

Corr PJ (2009) The reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Personality Psychology* (ed. P.J. Corr and G. Matthews), pp. 347–376. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, England,

Corr, PJ (2016) Reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality questionnaires: structural survey with recommendations. *Personality and Individual Differences* **89**, 60–64.

Corr PJ and Cooper AJ (2016) The reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality questionnaire (RST-PQ): development and validation. *Psychological Assessment* **28**(11), 1427–1440.

Davis KL and Panksepp J (2011) The brain's foundations of human personality and the Affective Neuroscience Personality Scales. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews* **35**(9), 1946–1958.

Davis KL, Panksepp J and Normansell L (2003) The affective neuroscience personality scales: normative data and implications. *Neuro-Psychoanalysis* **5**(1), 57–69.

DePascalis V, Scacchia P, Sommer K and Checcucci C (2019) Psychopathy traits and reinforcement sensitivity theory: prepulse inhibition and ERP responses. *Biological Psychology* **148**, 107771.

Derefinko KJ, Eisenlohr-Moul TA, Peters JR, Roberts W, Walsh EC, Milich R and Lynam DR (2016) Physiological response to reward and extinction predicts alcohol, marijuana, and cigarette use two years later. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* **163**(S1), S29–36.

DeYoung CG (2013) The neuromodulator of exploration: a unifying theory of the role of dopamine in personality. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **7**, 762. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2013.00762.

Dremencov E, Newman ME, Kinor M, Blatman-Jan G, Schindler DJ, Overstreet DH and Yadid G (2005) Hyperfunctionality of serotonin-2C receptor-mediated inhibition of accumbal dopamine release in an animal model of depression is reversed by antidepressant treatment. *Neuropharmacology* **48**, 34–42.

Emery NN and Simons JS (2017) A reinforcement sensitivity model of affective and behavioral dysregulation in marijuana use and associated problems. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology* **25**(4), 281–294.

Fletcher PJ, Tampakeras M and Yeomans JS (1995) Median raphe injections of 8-OH-DPAT lower frequency thresholds of lateral hypothalamic self-stimulation. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior* **52**(1), 65–71.

Gao J, Pan Z, Jiao Z, Li F, Zhao G, Wei Q, Pan F and Evangelou E (2012) TPH2 gene polymorphisms and major depression — a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **7**, e36721.

Gaher RM, Hahn AM, Shishido H, Simons JS and Gaster S (2015) Associations between sensitivity to punishment, sensitivity to reward, and gambling. *Addictive Behaviors* **42**, 180–184.

Goldberg LR (1999) A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In *Personality Psychology in Europe* (ed. I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt and F. Ostendorf), pp. 7–28.Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Golden SA, Heins C, Venniro M, Caprioli D, Zhang M, Epstein DH and Shaham Y (2017) Compulsive addiction-like aggressive behavior in mice. *Biological Psychiatry* **82**, 239–248.

Gray JA (1994) Three fundamental emotion systems. In *The Nature of Emotion: Fundamental Questions* (ed. P. Ekman and J.R. Davidson), pp. 243–247. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gray JA and McNaughton N (2000) *The Neuropsychology of Anxiety: An Enquiry into the Functions of the Septo-Hippocampal System*. Second edition. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Hahn T, Notebaert KH, Dresler T, Kowarsh L, Reif A and Fallgatter AJ (2014) Linking online gaming and addictive behavior: converging evidence for a general reward deficiency in frequent onlne gamers. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience* **8**, 385. doi: 10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00385.

Harro J and Oreland L. (2016) The role of MAO in personality and drug use. *Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* **69**, 101–111.

Harro M, Eensoo D, Kiive E, Merenäkk L, Alep J, Oreland L and Harro J (2001) Platelet monoamine oxidase in healthy 9- and 15-years old children: the effect of gender, smoking and puberty. *Progress in Neuropsychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* **25**(8), 1497–1511.

Harro J, Laas K, Eensoo D, Kurrikoff T, Sakala K, Vaht M, Parik J, Mäestu J and Veidebaum T (2019) Orexin/hypocretin receptor gene (*HCRTR1*) variation is associated with aggressive behaviour. *Neuropharmacology* **156**, 107527. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropharm.2019.02.009.

Hausman EM, Kotov R, Perlman G, Hajcak G, Kessel EM and Klein DM (2018) Prospective predictors of first-onset depressive disorders in adolescent females with anxiety disorders. *Journal of Affective Disorders* **235**, 176–183.

Holroyd CB, Baker TE, Kerns KA and Müller U (2008) Electrophysiological evidence of atypical motivation and reward processing in children with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Neuropsychologia* **46**(8), 2234–2242.

Jackson, CJ (2009) Jackson-5 scales of revised Reinforcement Sensitivity Theory (r-RST) and their application to dysfunctional real world outcomes. *Journal of Research in Personality* **43**, 556–569.

Johnson JL, Kim LM, Giovannelli TS and Cagle T (2010) Reinforcement sensitivity theory, vengeance, and forgiveness. *Personality and Individual Differences* **48**(5), 612–616.

Joyner KJ, Bowyer CB, Yancey JR, Venables NC, Foell J, Worthy DA, Hajcak G, Bartholow BD and Patrick CJ (2019) Blunted Reward Sensitivity and Trait Disinhibition Interact to Predict Substance Use Problems. *Clinical Psychological Science* **7**(5), 1109–1124.

Keiser HN and Ross SR (2011) Carver and Whites' BIS/FFFS/BAS scales and domains and facets of the Five Factor Model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences* **51**(1), 39–44.

Kessler RC, Adler L, Ames M, Demler O, Faraone S, Hiripi E, Howes MJ, Jin R, Secnik K, Spencer T, Ustun TB and Walters EE (2005) The World Health Organization Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS): a short screening scale for use in the general population. *Psychological Medicine* **35**(2), 245–256.

Kiive E and Harro J (2013) The effect of serotonin transporter gene promoter polymorphism on adolescent and adult ADHD symptoms and educational attainment: a longitudinal study. *European Psychiatry* **28**(6), 372–378.

Kiive E, Laas K, Akkermann K, Comasco E, Oreland L, Veidebaum T and Harro J (2014) Mitigating aggressiveness through education? The monoamine oxidase A genotype and mental health in general population. *Acta Neuropsychiatrica* **26**(1), 19–28.

King RS (2015) Cluster Analysis and Data Mining: An Introduction. Mercury Learning and Information LLC. ISBN: 978-1-938549-38-0

Kriegebaum C, Song NN, Gutknecht L, Huang Y, Schmitt A, Reif A, Ding YQ and Lesch KP (2010) Brain-specific conditional and time-specific inducible Tph2 knockout mice possess normal serotonergic gene expression in the absence of serotonin during adult life. *Neurochemistry International* **57**(5), 512–517.

Kwan JW, Bauer IE, Hautzinger M and Meyer TD (2020) Reward sensitivity and the course of bipolar disorder: a survival analysis in a treatment seeking sample. *Journal of Affective Disorders* **261**, 126–130.

Laas K, Kiive E, Mäestu J, Vaht M, Veidebaum T and Harro J (2017) Nice guys: homozygocity for the *TPH2*-703G/T (rs4570625) minor allele promotes low aggressiveness and low anxiety. *Journal of Affective Disorders* **215**, 230–236.

Latsko MS, Gilman TL, Matt LM, Nylocks KM, Cofman KG and Jasnow AM (2016) A novel interaction between tryptophan hydroxylase 2 (TPH2) gene polymorphism (rs4570625) and BDNF Val66Met predicts a high-risk emotional phenotype in healthy subjects. *PLoS One* **11**(10):e0162585. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0162585.

https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lahvis, GP (2017) Social reward and empathy as proximal contributions to altruism: the Camaraderie Effect. *Current Topics in Behavioral Neurosciences* **30**, 127–157.

Lehto K, Vaht M, Mäestu J, Veidebaum T and Harro J (2015) Effect of tryptophan hydroxylase-2 gene polymorphism G-703T on personality in a population representative sample. *Progress in Neuropsychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry* **57**, 31–35.

Leue A, Brocke B and Hoyer J (2008) Reinforcement sensitivity of sex offenders and non-offenders: an experimental and psychometric study of reinforcement sensitivity theory. *British Journal of Psychology* **99**(Pt 3), 361–378.

Lin YM, Chao SC, Chen TM, Lai TJ, Chen JS and Sun HS (2007) Association of functional polymorphisms of the human tryptophan hydroxylase 2 gene with risk for bipolar disorder in Han Chinese. *Archives of General Psychiatry* **64**(9), 1015–1024.

Luman M, Oosterlaan J, Knol DL and Sergeant JA (2008) Decision-making in ADHD: sensitive to frequency but blind to the magnitude of penalty? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* **49**(7), 712–722.

Luo M, Zhou J and Liu Z. (2015) Reward processing by the dorsal raphe nucleus: 5-HT and beyond. *Learning and Memory* **22**(9), 452–460.

Luo Y, Weibman D, Halperin JM and Li X (2019) A review of heterogeneity in attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2019.00042

Marx I, Hacker T, Yu X, Cortese S and Sonuga-Barke E (2018) ADHD and the choice of small immediate over larger delayed rewards: a comparative meta-analysis of performance on simple choice-delay and temporal discounting paradigms. *Journal of Attention Disorders* doi: 10.1177/1087054718772138.

Meis LA, Erbes CR, Kramer MD, Arbisi PA, Kehle-Forbes SM, DeGarmo DS, Shallcross SL and Polusny MA (2017) Using reinforcement sensitivity to understand longitudinal links between PTSD and relationship adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology* **31**(1), 71–81.

Miczek KA, Mos J and Olivier B (1989) Brain 5-HT and inhibition of aggressive behavior in animals: 5-HIAA and receptor subtypes. *Psychopharmacology Bulletin* **25**, 399–403.

Mitchell JT, Kimbrel NA, Hundt N, Cobb AR, Nelson-Gray RO and Lootens CM (2007) An analysis of reinforcement sensitivity theory and the five-factor model. *European Journal of Personality* **21**(7), 869–887.

Mohebi A, Pettibone JA, Hamid AA, Wong JT, Vinson LT, Patriarchi T, Tian L, Kennedy RT and Berke JD (2019) Dissociable dopamine dynamics for learning and motivation. *Nature* **570**, 65–70.

Montag C and Panksepp J (2017) Primary emotional systems and personality: an evolutionary perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology* **8**, 464. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00464.

Montag C, Sindermann C, Becker B and Panksepp J (2016) An affective neuroscience framework for the molecular study of internet addiction. *Frontiers in Psychology* **7**, 1906. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01906.

Montag C, Widenhorn-Müller K, Panksepp J and Kiefer M (2017) Individual differences in Affective Neuroscience Personality Scale (ANPS) primary emotional traits and depressive tendencies. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* **73**, 136–142.

Mõttus R, Pullmann H and Allik J (2006) Toward more readable big five personality inventories. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* **22**(3), 149–157.

Ottenhof KW, Sild M, Lévesque ML, Ruhe HG and Booij L (2018) *TPH2* polymorphisms across the spectrum of psychiatric morbidity: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews* **92**, 29–42.

Paaver M, Eensoo D, Pulver A and Harro, J (2006) Adaptive and maladaptive impulsivity, platelet monoamine oxidase (MAO) activity and risk-admitting in different types of risky drivers. *Psychopharmacology* **186**(1), 32–40.

Panksepp J (1998) Affective Neuroscience: The Foundations of Human and Animal Emotions. Oxford University Press.

Panksepp, J (2016) The cross-mammalian neurophenomenology of primal emotional affects: from animal feelings to human therapeutics. *Journal of Comparative Neurology* **524**(8), 1624–1635.

Papinczak ZE, Connor JP, Harnett P and Gullo MJ (2018) A biosocial cognitive model of cannabis use in emerging adulthood. *Addictive Behaviors* **76**, 229–235.

Patton JH, Stanford MS and Barratt ES (1995) Factor structure of the Barratt Impulsiveness Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* **51**(6), 768–774.

Pearson R, McGeary JE and Beevers CG (2014) Association between serotonin cumulative genetic score and the Behavioral Approach System (BAS): moderation by early life environment. *Personality and Individual Differences* **70**, 140–144.

Ping L, Xu J, Zhou C, Lu J, Lu Y, Shen Z, Jiang L, Dai N, Xu X and Cheng Y (2019) Tryptophan hydroxylase-2 polymorphism is associated with white matter integrity in first-episode, medication-naive major depressive disorder patients. *Psychiatry Research: Neuroimaging* **286**, 4–10.

Richards JS, Arias Vásquez A, von Rhein D, van der Meer D, Franke B, Hoekstra PJ, Heslenfeld DJ, Oosterlaan J, Faraone SV, Buitelaar JK and Hartman CA (2016) Adolescent behavioral and neural reward sensitivity: a test of the differential susceptibility theory. *Translational Psychiatry* **6**, e771. doi: 10.1038/tp.2016.37.

Segarra P, Poy R, Lopez R and Molto J (2014) Characterizing Carver and White's BIS/BAS subscales using the Five Factor Model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences* **61**, 18–23.

Smillie LD, Jach HK, Hughes DM, Wacker J, Cooper JA and Pickering AD (2019) Extraversion and reward-processing: consolidating evidence from an electroencephalographic index of reward-prediction-error. *Biological Psychology* **146**, 107735. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsycho.2019.107735.

Smillie LD and Wacker J (2014) Dopaminergic foundations of personality and individual differences. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **8**, 874. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2014.00874.

Spielberger CD, Gorsuch RL, Lushene R, Vagg PR and Jacobs GA (1983) *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.

Tao S, Chattun MR, Yan R, Geng J, Zhu R, Shao J, Lu Q and Yao Z (2018) TPH-2 gene polymorphism in major depressive disorder patients with early-wakening syndrome. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* **12**, 827. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2018.00827.

Tatnell DG, Loxton NJ, Modecki KL and Hamilton K (2019) Testing a model of reward sensitivity, implicit and explicit drinker identity and hazardous drinking. *Psychology and Health* **34**(12), 1407–1420.

Tomson-Johanson K, Kaart T, Kiivet RA, Veidebaum T and Harro J (2020) Low cholesterol levels in children predict impulsivity in young adulthood. *Acta Neuropsychiatrica* 1–10. doi: 10.1017/neu.2019.48.

Torrente F, López P, Lischinsky A, Cetkovic-Bakmas M and Manes F (2017) Depressive symptoms and the role of affective temperaments in adults with attention-defict/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD): a comparison with bipolar disorder. *Journal of Affective Disorders* **221**, 304–311.

Torrubia R, Avila C, Molto J and Caseras X (2001) The Sensitivity to Punishment and Sensitivity to Reward Questionnaire (SPSRQ) as a measure of Gray's anxiety and impulsivity dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences* **31**(6), 837–862.

Unterrainer H-F, Hiebler-Ragger M, Koschutnig K, Fuchshuber J, Tscheschner S, Url M, Wagner-Skacel J, Reininghaus EZ, Papousek I, Weiss EM and Fink A (2017) Addiction as an attachment disorder: white matter impairment is linked to increased negative affective states in poly-drug use. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **11**, 208. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2017.0020.

Walker BR, Jackson CJ and Frost R. (2017) A comparison of revised reinforcement sensitivity theory with other contemporary personality models. *Personality and Individual Differences* **109**, 232–236.

Wernicke J, Li M, Sha P, Zhou M, Sindermann C, Becker B, Kendrick KM and Montag C (2019) Individual differences in tendencies to attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and emotionality: empirical evidence in young healthy adults from Germany and China. *Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorders* **11**(2), 167–182.

https://doi.org/10.1017/neu.2020.18 Published online by Cambridge University Press