

Meta-analysis of real-time fMRI neurofeedback studies using individual participant data: How is brain regulation mediated?



Kirsten Emmert^{a,b,*,1}, Rotem Kopel^{a,b,1}, James Sulzer^c, Annette B. Brühl^{d,e}, Brian D. Berman^f, David E.J. Linden^g, Silvina G. Horowitz^h, Markus Breimhorstⁱ, Andrea Caria^j, Sabine Frank^j, Stephen Johnston^k, Zhiying Long^l, Christian Paret^{m,n}, Fabien Robineau^o, Ralf Veit^{j,p}, Andreas Bartsch^{q,r,s,t}, Christian F. Beckmann^{u,v,w}, Dimitri Van De Ville^{a,b}, Sven Haller^{x,y,z,aa}

^a Department of Radiology and Medical Informatics, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

^b Medical Image Processing Laboratory, Institute of Bioengineering, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland

^c Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

^d Department of Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, Psychiatric Hospital, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

^e Department of Psychiatry, Behavioural and Clinical Neuroscience Institute, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

^f Department of Neurology, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, CO, USA

^g MRC Centre for Neuropsychiatric Genetics & Genomics, Cardiff University School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

^h National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA

ⁱ Department of Neurology, University Medical Center of the Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz, Germany

^j Institute of Medical Psychology and Behavioral Neurobiology, University of Tuebingen, Germany

^k Department of Psychology, Swansea University, Swansea, UK

^l State Key Laboratory of Cognitive Neuroscience and Learning & IDG/McGovern Institute for Brain Research, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China

^m Department of Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychotherapy, Central Institute of Mental Health Mannheim, Medical Faculty Mannheim/Heidelberg University Mannheim, Germany

ⁿ Department for Neuroimaging, Central Institute of Mental Health Mannheim, Medical Faculty Mannheim/Heidelberg University Mannheim, Germany

^o Laboratory for Neurology and Imaging of Cognition, Department of Neurosciences, University of Geneva, Switzerland

^p Institute for Diabetes Research and Metabolic Diseases, Helmholtz Center Munich, University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany

^q Department of Neuroradiology, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

^r Department of Neuroradiology, University of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany

^s FMRIB Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

^t Department of Radiology, Bamberg Hospital, Bamberg, Germany

^u Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Centre for Cognitive Neuroimaging, Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

^v Radboud University Medical Centre, Department of Cognitive Neuroimaging, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

^w Oxford Centre for Functional MRI of the Brain, Nuffield Department of Clinical Neuroscience, University of Oxford, UK

^x Affidea Centre de Diagnostique Radiologique de Carouge CDRC, Geneva, Switzerland

^y Department of Surgical Sciences, Radiology, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

^z Department of Neuroradiology, University Hospital Freiburg, Germany

^{aa} Faculty of Medicine of the University of Geneva, Switzerland

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 9 June 2015

Accepted 19 September 2015

Available online 28 September 2015

Keywords:

Neurofeedback

Real-time fMRI

Brain regulation

ABSTRACT

An increasing number of studies using real-time fMRI neurofeedback have demonstrated that successful regulation of neural activity is possible in various brain regions. Since these studies focused on the regulated region(s), little is known about the target-independent mechanisms associated with neurofeedback-guided control of brain activation, i.e. the regulating network. While the specificity of the activation during self-regulation is an important factor, no study has effectively determined the network involved in self-regulation in general. In an effort to detect regions that are responsible for the act of brain regulation, we performed a post-hoc analysis of data involving different target regions based on studies from different research groups.

We included twelve suitable studies that examined nine different target regions amounting to a total of 175 subjects and 899 neurofeedback runs. Data analysis included a standard first- (single subject, extracting main paradigm) and second-level (single subject, all runs) general linear model (GLM) analysis of all participants taking into account the individual timing. Subsequently, at the third level, a random effects model GLM included all subjects of all studies, resulting in an overall mixed effects model. Since four of the twelve studies had a reduced field of view (FoV), we repeated the same analysis in a subsample of eight studies that had a well-overlapping FoV to obtain a more global picture of self-regulation.

* Corresponding author at: CIBM, Neuroradiology/DISIM, University Hospital Geneva, Gabrielle-Perret-Gentil 4, 1205 Geneva, Switzerland.

E-mail address: kirsten.emmert@unige.ch (K. Emmert).

¹ Both authors contributed equally.

The GLM analysis revealed that the anterior insula as well as the basal ganglia, notably the striatum, were consistently active during the regulation of brain activation across the studies. The anterior insula has been implicated in interoceptive awareness of the body and cognitive control. Basal ganglia are involved in procedural learning, visuomotor integration and other higher cognitive processes including motivation. The larger FoV analysis yielded additional activations in the anterior cingulate cortex, the dorsolateral and ventrolateral prefrontal cortex, the temporo-parietal area and the visual association areas including the temporo-occipital junction. In conclusion, we demonstrate that several key regions, such as the anterior insula and the basal ganglia, are consistently activated during self-regulation in real-time fMRI neurofeedback independent of the targeted region-of-interest. Our results imply that if the real-time fMRI neurofeedback studies target regions of this regulation network, such as the anterior insula, care should be given whether activation changes are related to successful regulation, or related to the regulation process per se. Furthermore, future research is needed to determine how activation within this regulation network is related to neurofeedback success.

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Neurofeedback using real-time functional magnetic resonance imaging (rt-fMRI) enables participants to obtain voluntary control over multiple brain regions. Studies using this technique have demonstrated that it may be possible to successfully manipulate brain areas including the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC, Weiskopf et al., 2003; Hamilton et al., 2011), the posterior cingulate cortex (Brewer and Garrison, 2014), the anterior insular cortex (AIC, Caria et al., 2007, 2010; Berman et al., 2013), posterior insular cortex (PIC, Rance et al., 2014), amygdala (Posse et al., 2003; Zotev et al., 2011; Bruhl et al., 2014), primary motor and somatosensory cortex cortices (Yoo and Jolesz, 2002; Berman et al., 2012), premotor area (Johnson et al., 2012), visual cortex (Shibata et al., 2011), auditory cortex (Yoo et al., 2006; Haller et al., 2013), substantia nigra/ventral tegmental area (Sulzer et al., 2013), nucleus accumbens (Greer et al., 2014) and inferior frontal gyrus (Rota et al., 2009; for a review see Ruiz et al., 2014).

Real-time fMRI neurofeedback has also been explored as a supplementary treatment for various neurological disorders. For instance, real-time fMRI neurofeedback has shown positive benefits for diseases such as schizophrenia (Ruiz et al., 2013), depression (Linden et al., 2012; Young et al., 2014), tinnitus (Haller et al., 2010), Parkinson's disease (Subramanian et al., 2011) and nicotine addiction (Canterberry et al., 2013; Hartwell et al., 2013; Li et al., 2013). However, effect size of neurofeedback varies and in a lot of studies some participants fail to attain self-regulation. The neural mechanisms of neurofeedback as used for self-regulation of bodily functions are not well understood, which may be a roadblock to achieving consistent outcomes between studies and successful translation into clinics.

One of the most important but least understood characteristics of neurofeedback is the specificity of activation during self-regulation. Previous investigations in real-time fMRI neurofeedback have attempted to control for specificity of the self-regulation using feedback from another region (deCharms et al., 2005), subtracting the mean activity of a reference slice that does not contain involved brain regions (Caria et al., 2007; Rota et al., 2009), or using post-hoc statistical methods (Blefari et al., 2015). In contrast, we are here interested in the regions that are additionally activated during self-regulation, that is, regions that are involved in the cognitively demanding task of neurofeedback regulation.

In their landmark study, deCharms et al. reported that reduced pain perception via ACC regulation may have resulted from the contribution of a higher order region despite rigorous controls (deCharms et al., 2005). If so, exactly which regions would be responsible for effects of self-regulation?

To answer this question, it is important to consider the cognitive processes involved during neurofeedback and the corresponding networks. One of these networks is the central executive network (CEN) that is active in most cognitively demanding task, likely reflecting working-memory involvement and decision-making (Koechlin & Summerfield, 2007; Miller & Cohen, 2001). It includes the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC) and the posterior parietal cortex (Sridharan et al., 2008). In

addition, the saliency network that is comprised of the AIC and the ACC as main components will be involved in neurofeedback relevant tasks including attentional control and monitoring. Menon and Uddin (2010) suggest that this network coordinates task-related information processing by recruiting various other, more specialized networks. For neurofeedback, these might include reward-learning areas, recruiting the striatum (Hollerman et al., 1998; Samejima et al., 2005; Daniel and Pollmann, 2014), the frontal cortex (Watanabe, 1996; O'Doherty et al., 2003) and areas responsible for interoception (Craig, 2002; Lerner et al., 2009) such as parts of the AIC. Neurofeedback will likely use subnetworks cutting through all the above-mentioned networks.

Indeed, studies using a single region of interest suggest involvement of the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC), the dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (dmPFC, Zotev et al., 2013), the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC, Haller et al., 2010) and the anterior mid-cingulate cortex (Lee et al., 2012) to anterior cingulate cortex (Lawrence et al., 2013; Zotev et al., 2013) in the regulation process. A number of feedback studies show activation of the posterior ACC (pACC), although this area was not targeted (e.g. Caria et al., 2007; Rota et al., 2009; Lee et al., 2012; Veit et al., 2012; Lawrence et al., 2013). Similarly, several studies reported activation of the insula during neurofeedback runs (e.g. Rota et al., 2009; Haller et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2012; Paret et al., 2014).

In the current investigation, we assess the brain network mediating regulation in real-time fMRI neurofeedback. We hypothesized that regardless of the target region used, a common brain network is involved in the regulation process itself. Consequently, we performed a meta-analysis using individual participant data (IPD meta-analysis) across multiple previously reported rt-fMRI neurofeedback studies with different target regions in order to cancel out target region-specific effects and identify those activations commonly related to the regulation process. It should be noted that, at the current stage, we cannot distinguish between self-regulation processes and other processes involved in neurofeedback including feedback processing and learning as the current study does not include control runs without feedback ("transfer runs"). Our results suggest the existence of a neurofeedback network consisting of the anterior insula, basal ganglia, dorsal parts of the parietal lobe extending to the temporo-parietal junction, ACC, dlPFC, ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (vlPFC) and visual association areas including the temporo-occipital junction.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study selection

Studies were selected based on a Web of Knowledge (<https://apps.wofknowledge.com>) search for the keywords: "real time fMRI", "real time functional" or "rtfMRI" (in January 2014) as well as studies indicated in the real-time community (rtfmri@sympa.ethz.ch, updated in August 2015 to rtFIN@utlists.utexas.edu) literature updates. This search provided us with a total of 316 publications. Next, we used the following selection criteria, 1) rt-fMRI neurofeedback, 2) 1.5 or 3.0 T

static field strength, 3) at least four healthy participants, and 4) at least three neurofeedback runs. These criteria were used to exclude technical proof-of-principle studies (usually with less subjects) as opposed to the “typical” neurofeedback studies using standard methodology. Twenty-eight studies were aggregated based on these criteria. Subsequently, we contacted the corresponding authors, and 12 of these corresponding authors agreed to provide us with the raw data of 12 studies that were used for the analysis.

2.2. Included studies

We were able to obtain 12 studies targeting nine different regions of interest, notably the insula (5), amygdala (2), primary motor cortex (1), premotor cortex (1), auditory cortex (1), visual cortex (1), anterior cingulate cortex (1), substantia nigra/ventral tegmental area (1) and the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (1). Overall, a total of 175 subjects performed 899 neurofeedback runs. The studies are summarized in Table 1.

2.3. Analysis of MRI data

A standard mixed effects general linear model (GLM) analysis was conducted in FMRIB Software Library (FSL 5.0.6, FMRIB, Oxford, UK) (Smith et al., 2004). Preprocessing was performed using standard parameters (motion correction, co-registration, normalization to Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space, smoothing using a 5 mm Gaussian kernel).

The first level analysis used the individual study's block design as a regressor to model neurofeedback blocks. At the second level, all runs per subject were combined in a fixed effects analysis. Finally, a third level FMRIB's local analysis and mixed effects (FLAME1, Woolrich et al., 2004) analysis was conducted to combine all subjects of all studies resulting in an overall mixed effects analysis. At the third level, the analysis was performed including coding for the different studies as co-regressors.

Due to the restricted brain coverage of some studies, we performed this analysis two times. The first analysis used the entire data set and the restricted overlapping field of view (FoV) covered by all 175 subjects (see Supplementary Fig. 1 for FoV and regions of interest). In order to provide insight into regions outside of this small overlapping FoV, the analysis was repeated with a subsample of 8 studies and 103 subjects (first 8 rows of Table 1, see Supplementary Fig. 2 for FoV) with a larger overlapping FoV. All resulting activations were family wise error (FWE) multiple-comparison corrected using voxel-based thresholding at $p < 0.05$.

3. Results

The third level mixed effects analysis of all 12 studies yielded two main regions that are consistently activated during neurofeedback: the bilateral anterior insula and the basal ganglia. Considering the subsample analysis with a larger field of view ($n = 8$ studies) additional significant areas include the posterior ACC (pACC), the bilateral ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (vlPFC) and an area in the bilateral dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC) extending to the premotor cortex (PMC), a large temporo-parietal area bilaterally, and lateral occipital areas including visual association areas and the temporo-occipital junction bilaterally (see Fig. 1). In addition, the analysis with 8 studies showed additional brain areas that are deactivated during neurofeedback, including the posterior cingulate cortex (PCC), the precuneus and bilateral transverse temporal area (see Fig. 1 and Table 2).

4. Discussion

The IPD meta-analysis of rt-fMRI neurofeedback studies with a variety of target regions identified a regulation network that includes notably the anterior insula, the basal ganglia, the temporo-parietal area, the ACC, the dlPFC, the vlPFC and the visual association area including the temporo-occipital junction (see Fig. 2).

Anterior insula activation is known to occur during interoceptive cognition and self-awareness processes (Craig, 2002; Critchley et al., 2004). Additionally, specifically the right AIC and the adjacent vlPFC are implicated in cognitive control tasks such as motor inhibition, reorienting and action updating (Levy and Wagner, 2011) using fronto-basal-ganglia connections. Similarly, basal ganglia are involved in interoceptive processes (Schneider et al., 2008) and also motivational processing (Lehericy and Gerardin, 2002; Arsalidou et al., 2013), as needed in feedback tasks. Moreover, the basal ganglia are essential for learning; whereas the dorsomedial striatum is known to be involved in declarative learning, the dorsoventral striatum is a key region mediating procedural learning (Yin and Knowlton, 2006; Balleine and O'Doherty, 2010). Interestingly, in their review Aron et al. pointed out that cognitive control tasks often employ a fronto-basal-ganglia network, which might explain our observation of both AIC/vlPFC and BG activation (Aron et al., 2014).

The temporo-parietal activation could be related to integration of the visual feedback and feedback related processes involving recall of memories (Zimmer, 2008) as well as self-processing and multisensory integration of body-related information (Arzy et al., 2006). PACC activation might reflect motivational aspects of the neurofeedback such as the rewarding effect of positive feedback and avoidance of negative

Table 1
Studies included in the current post-hoc analysis. In addition to the analysis across all studies, the analysis was repeated using the first eight studies (highlighted in bold) with a larger field of view.

Study	Target area	N	Sessions	Runs per session	Regulation	External stimuli	Blocks per run	Length of block [s]	Type of localizer
1) Berman et al. (2012)	Primary Motor Cortex	10	1	3	UP	–	5	20	Functional
2) Berman et al. (2013)	Rostral Insula	13	1	4	UP	–	4	30	Functional
3) Bruhl et al. (2014)	Amygdala	6	4	2–3, total: 8–11 runs	DOWN, NO	Visual (pictures)	10	20	Functional
4) Hui et al. (2014)	Premotor Cortex	12	1	4	UP	–	7	30	Functional
5) Johnston et al. (2011)	vlPFC, IC, others	17	1	3	UP	–	12	20	Functional
6) Paret et al. (2014)	Amygdala	16	1	3	DOWN	Visual (pictures)	15	26	Functional
7) Robineau et al. (2014)	Visual Cortex (interhem. balance)	14	3	4	UP (one hemisphere stronger than other one)	–	3	30	Functional
8) Sulzer et al. (2013)	SN/VTA	15	1	3	UP	–	9	20	Anatomical
9a) Emmert et al. (2014)-AIC	Anterior insula	14	1	4	DOWN	Pain	4	30	Functional
9b) Emmert et al. (2014)-ACC	ACC	14	1	4	DOWN	Pain	4	30	Functional
10) Frank et al. (2012)	anterior Insula	21	2	3	UP	–	7	30	Anatomical
11) Haller et al. (2013)	Auditory cortex	12	4	4	DOWN	Auditory	4	58	Functional
12) Veit et al. (2012)	Anterior Insula	11	1	3	UP, DOWN, NO	Visual (pictures)	6	9	Functional




Fig. 1. Main effect of the third level mixed effects analysis. (A) Results from the main analysis using all 12 studies with a restricted field of view (FoV) (B) Results from the subsample analysis of eight studies with a larger FoV. The light gray area indicates the overlapping FoV, areas in red–yellow indicate regions that are active during regulation, while areas in dark–light blue depict areas with reduced activation during regulation (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.).

feedback (Amiez et al., 2005; Magno et al., 2006; Posner et al., 2007). The dlPFC and premotor areas are implicated in the imagination of action, which likely relates to the mental imagery used during neurofeedback (Hanakawa et al., 2003; Lotze and Halsband, 2006). Finally, visual association area activation and the temporo-occipital junction activation may reflect visual imagery (D’Esposito et al., 1997; Zimmer, 2008) as well as processing of the visual feedback. To differentiate between effects of visual feedback and visual imagery one would have to include studies that use non-visual feedback. Unfortunately, to our knowledge, when conducting the search for real-time fMRI studies in 2014, there was only one study (Posse et al., 2003) using auditory feedback and this study did not fit our criteria (only two feedback runs for four of the six subjects).

In addition, our analysis showed some brain areas that were deactivated during neurofeedback, including the PCC as well as the precuneus. These areas are part of the default mode network (Raichle et al., 2001; Greicius et al., 2003; Raichle and Snyder, 2007), which is consistently deactivated during cognitively demanding tasks.

Additionally, the transverse temporal area shows deactivations, possibly reflecting a shift of the focus away from scanner noise during the task i.e., a decrease of auditory activation due to visual feedback (Laurienti et al., 2002) and/or the task performance.

As most studies included in our IPD meta-analysis involved participants attempting to up-regulate a target brain area, the effect of regulation and the areas involved in the regulation process per se cannot be distinguished in these studies. One study aiming at down regulation of the auditory cortex (Haller et al., 2010) found that the dlPFC and vmPFC were simultaneously up-regulated, suggesting that these areas might be involved in the regulation process. In accordance with this study, we found an up regulation of the dlPFC. Additionally, we detected pACC activation that is close to the vmPFC area. Due to our restricted FoV we have no data available to validate the vmPFC activation itself. Increased basal ganglia and thalamus activation over runs has also been previously reported in a neurofeedback study (Lawrence et al., 2013). Other studies suggested that a part of the ACC and anterior mid-cingulate cortex is involved in brain regulation (Lee et al., 2012; Lawrence et

Table 2
MNI coordinates of the local maxima of all reported clusters of subsample analysis (n = 8) using a larger field of view.

Activations							
Cluster	Area	MNI coordinates			t-Stat value	z-Stat value	
		X	Y	Z			
1	pACC	6	20	36	10.57	8.58	
2	AIC R	32	26	4	12.30	9.49	
	AIC L	−36	20	−2	13.66	10.14	
3	vlPFC R	54	12	14	9.79	8.12	
	vlPFC L	−50	8	4	11.00	8.81	
	dlPFC/PMC R	42	0	42	10.05	8.27	
	dlPFC/PMC L	−34	−4	40	11.42	9.04	
4	Temporo-parietal R	62	−34	34	6.73	6.07	
	Temporo-parietal L	−58	−32	32	7.64	6.73	
	Parietal R	30	−48	40	5.42	5.05	
	Parietal L	−30	−48	38	7.78	6.82	
5	Occipital R	46	−58	12	7.62	6.71	
	Occipital L	−46	−70	8	7.82	6.85	
6	Basal ganglia (BG) & thalamus	Strong activation with several local maxima throughout BG (putamen, caudate nucleus, nucleus accumbens, globus pallidus) and thalamus.					
		20	0	10	11.04	8.83	
		−20	0	12	11.07	8.85	
Deactivations							
Cluster	Area	MNI coordinates			t-Stat value	z-Stat value	
		X	Y	Z			
1	Precuneus	0	−68	24	7.59	6.70	
	PCC	8	−56	38	6.44	5.85	
2	Temporal transverse L	−36	−20	16	9.72	8.08	
	Temporal transverse R	38	−14	18	8.34	7.21	
3	Parietal R	46	−68	36	6.71	6.06	




Fig. 2. Schematic display of main brain areas involved in self-regulation. This network includes the ACC (yellow), the dorsolateral PFC extending to PMC (dark green), the ventrolateral PFC (light green), the anterior insula (red), the basal ganglia and thalamus (orange), part of the inferior and superior parietal lobes extending to the temporo-parietal junction (violet) and the lateral occipital cortex extending to the temporo-occipital junction (blue) (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.).

al., 2013; Zotev et al., 2013). This result is also confirmed by our analysis. However, for the studies using a single ROI we cannot exclude the possibility that the shown effect was a result of the brain regulation (i.e., the activation was caused by the target region activation change) rather than the regulation process itself.

One study used several different visual regions of interest within the same subjects (Harmelech et al., 2015) and showed that some of the higher-level visual areas and the inferior parietal lobe (IPL) are easier to regulate than lower-level areas such as V1. Our study showed involvement of part of the IPL during self-regulation in general. This observation implies that the observed activation change in the IPL in this study might in fact be a mix between activation change due to successful neurofeedback and activation related to the cognitively demanding process of regulation per se. Note however, that this study employed auditory feedback, whereas all studies in our IPD meta-analysis used visual feedback. Unfortunately, this study does not report about common activation outside of their chosen target regions.

Other studies that assessed processes related to self-regulation including meditation, mental imagery and sham neurofeedback reported activations that are partly overlapping with our results. For example, an involvement of the lateral PFC and the insula was observed in experienced meditators during mindfulness meditation (Farb et al., 2007) underlining the importance of these areas for self-awareness in the present.

Additionally, some of the reported regions, especially the parietal and prefrontal areas, are implicated in mental imagery (McNorgan, 2012), which could be one cognitive component involved in neurofeedback regulation. Temporo-occipital activation can be observed specifically during visual imagery of form and motion (McNorgan, 2012).

Interestingly, another study assessing sham neurofeedback reported very similar activations (Ninaus et al., 2013). The authors reported the involvement of the bilateral insula, dorsomedial and lateral PFC, supplementary motor area, left ACC, right superior parietal lobe, right middle frontal activation, left supramarginal gyrus and left thalamus during attempted brain regulation with sham feedback in comparison to a passive viewing condition. This suggests that, independent of the outcome of the neurofeedback, a wide network of areas involved in cognitive control and sensory processing is recruited during attempted self-regulation. When looking at the comparison of viewing of moving bars and viewing of static bars, they found, among others, a strong activation in the middle occipital gyrus, very similar to the temporo-occipital activation found in this study, confirming that this activation is likely induced

by the visual stimulation during feedback delivery. However, Ninaus et al. do not report a significant activation of the basal ganglia that showed strong activation in our IPD meta-analyses. This difference might either result from the difference in contrast (comparison against rest vs. comparison against passive viewing of moving bars) or might reflect a learning process specific to neurofeedback, that is not present in the sham feedback condition.

In order to test for neurofeedback-specific effects, some rt-fMRI studies include a transfer run without feedback presentation (e.g. Haller et al., 2013; Sulzer et al., 2013). These transfer runs can help to disentangle learning effects from the actual regulation process. In the future, when more studies using a transfer run will be available, a novel IPD meta-analysis could be run that includes a contrast of transfer runs in comparison to normal feedback runs to more specifically identify the neuronal mechanisms underlying visually-guided neurofeedback.

Our analysis combined up or down regulation studies under the assumption that the brain networks involved in the process of regulation per se should be active during regulation regardless of regulation direction. The only included study that used up and down regulation in the same subjects found IFG activation for up and down regulation, supporting this view that the regulation-related network is active regardless of the regulation direction (Veit et al., 2012). Note however that in this specific investigation, the IFG was also part of the target region and consequently there is a potentially confounding overlap between activations related to the process of regulation, and activations to be regulated within this region. Future, specifically designed studies that ideally directly compare up versus down regulation within the same participants are needed to further elucidate this issue.

4.1. Limitations

It might be interesting to further refine the data analysis by taking into account regulation success. It should be noted that there currently is no gold standard for the measurement of regulation success in healthy subjects. This could be either a neuroimaging variable (e.g. decrease of beta value) or a behavioral measurement (performance in a task relevant for the targeted area). In the absence of clearly established measurement for regulation success, notably in the current analysis across several experimental setups and target regions, it is not possible to unambiguously define a universal regulation success parameter across studies. When such a gold standard is established in the field, further investigation into correlations of activation with regulation success would be desirable to assess in detail regions related to successful neurofeedback regulation.

Further limitations include the limited FoV due to the individual slice positioning that was intended to include the individual region of interest and not necessarily whole brain coverage. We included only studies with visual feedback. Therefore, our results also reflect visual processing of the feedback. In all rt-fMRI studies, including those used for our analysis, learning processes could confound the regulation process as the subjects learn to self-regulate by watching the feedback.

The presented findings may be somewhat limited by the relatively low number of studies included (8 for large FoV, 12 for small FoV). The reason for this limitation is the rather small number of suitable studies available in this field and the fact that this IPD meta-analysis looked at the data itself requiring permission to use the original data. On the other hand the procedure of unifying the analysis steps using original data instead of comparing activation clusters reported in the literature should enhance the transparency and thus interpretability of results.

In addition, this analysis is retrospective and the design of the studies was not optimized for the IPD meta-analysis. Therefore, data acquisition parameters and paradigm (blocks, runs, sessions, up or down regulation, stimuli, instructions) vary considerably across studies. On the other hand, this can also be considered as strength as it indicates the general validity of our results as the data covers a range of different experimental setups and designs.

4.2. Outlook

This IDP meta-analysis is a first step towards an understanding of the underlying mechanisms of self-regulation. As this was a post-hoc analysis using studies that were designed independently, not all interesting scientific questions could be answered using these data. Here we mention a number of points that could be answered in future studies specifically designed for this purpose:

- What regions are implicated in the neurofeedback modality? E.g., study comparing visual and auditory feedback.
- Are there differences in the regulation matrix depending on the direction of regulation? E.g., study using up and down regulation within the same subjects for at least two different target regions.
- Which behavioral measures reflect neurofeedback efficacy independent of the target regions? Use these instead of/ in addition to target-region specific behavioral measures such as auditory, emotional or visual variables for regions such as auditory cortex, amygdala and visual cortex, respectively.
- What is the time line of neurofeedback learning (steady-state, linear or non-linear learning curve)?

5. Conclusion

Brain self-regulation during rt-fMRI neurofeedback involves a complex regulation network, including notably AIC, BG and the ACC. Taking into account the limitation that the current investigation is a retrospective IPD meta-analysis of rt-fMRI studies, which were not specifically designed for this purpose, our results suggest that some target regions of rt-fMRI neurofeedback studies (notably insula and ACC) are also implicated in the process of regulation per se. This may therefore represent a potential confound for the regulation of these areas.

6. Support

This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (project 320030_147126/1, 320030_127079/1 and the Marie Heim-Vögtlin grants PMCDP2_145442 and PMCDP2_162223) and the Center for Biomedical Imaging (CIBM, Geneva, Switzerland).

We are very grateful to all of the researchers who kindly supplied us with data from their studies. This work was supported by data from Brian Berman & Silvina Horovitz, Markus Breimhorst, Annette Brühl, Andrea Caria, Sabine Frank, Steve Johnston & David Linden, Zhiying Long, Christian Paret, Fabien Robineau, James Sulzer and Ralf Veit.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.09.042>.

References

Amiez, C., Joseph, J.P., Procyk, E., 2005. Anterior cingulate error-related activity is modulated by predicted reward. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* 21, 3447–3452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-9568.2005.04170.x>.

Aron, A.R., Robbins, T.W., Poldrack, R.A., 2014. Inhibition and the right inferior frontal cortex: one decade on. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 18, 177–185. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.12.003>.

Arsalidou, M., Duerden, E.G., Taylor, M.J., 2013. The centre of the brain: topographical model of motor, cognitive, affective, and somatosensory functions of the basal ganglia. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 34, 3031–3054. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22124>.

Arzy, S., Thut, G., Mohr, C., Michel, C.M., Blanke, O., 2006. Neural basis of embodiment: distinct contributions of temporoparietal junction and extrastriate body area. *J. Neurosci.* 26, 8074–8081. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0745-06.2006>.

Balleine, B.W., O'doherty, J.P., 2010. Human and rodent homologies in action control: corticostriatal determinants of goal-directed and habitual action. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 35, 48–69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/npp.2009.131>.

Berman, B.D., Horovitz, S.G., Venkataraman, G., Hallett, M., 2012. Self-modulation of primary motor cortex activity with motor and motor imagery tasks using real-time

fMRI-based neurofeedback. *Neuroimage* 59, 917–925. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.07.035>.

Berman, B.D., Horovitz, S.G., Hallett, M., 2013. Modulation of functionally localized right insular cortex activity using real-time fMRI-based neurofeedback. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7, 638. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00638>.

Blefari, M.L., Sulzer, J., Hepp-Reymond, M.C., Kollias, S., Gassert, R., 2015. Improvement in precision grip force control with self-modulation of primary motor cortex during motor imagery. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* 9, 18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00018>.

Brewer, J.A., Garrison, K.A., 2014. The posterior cingulate cortex as a plausible mechanistic target of meditation: findings from neuroimaging. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1307, 19–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12246>.

Bruhl, A.B., Scherpiet, S., Sulzer, J., Stampfli, P., Seifritz, E., Herwig, U., 2014. Real-time neurofeedback using functional MRI could improve down-regulation of amygdala activity during emotional stimulation: a proof-of-concept study. *Brain Topogr.* 27, 138–148. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10548-013-0331-9>.

Canterberry, M., Hanlon, C.A., Hartwell, K.J., Li, X., Owens, M., Lematty, T., Prisciandaro, J.J., Borckardt, J., Saladin, M.E., Brady, K.T., George, M.S., 2013. Sustained reduction of nicotine craving with real-time neurofeedback: exploring the role of severity of dependence. *Nicotine Tob. Res.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntt122>.

Caria, A., Veit, R., Sitaram, R., Lotze, M., Weiskopf, N., Grodd, W., Birbaumer, N., 2007. Regulation of anterior insular cortex activity using real-time fMRI. *Neuroimage* 35, 1238–1246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.01.018>.

Caria, A., Sitaram, R., Veit, R., Begliomini, C., Birbaumer, N., 2010. Volitional control of anterior insula activity modulates the response to aversive stimuli. A real-time functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Biol. Psychiatry* 68, 425–432. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2010.04.020>.

Craig, A.D., 2002. How do you feel? Interoception: the sense of the physiological condition of the body. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 3, 655–666. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrn894>.

Critchley, H.D., Wiens, S., Rotshtein, P., Ohman, A., Dolan, R.J., 2004. Neural systems supporting interoceptive awareness. *Nat. Neurosci.* 7, 189–195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nn1176>.

Daniel, R., Pollmann, S., 2014. A universal role of the ventral striatum in reward-based learning: evidence from human studies. *Neurobiol. Learn. Mem.* 114, 90–100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2014.05.002>.

Decharms, R.C., Maeda, F., Glover, G.H., Ludlow, D., Pauly, J.M., Soneji, D., Gabrieli, J.D., Mackey, S.C., 2005. Control over brain activation and pain learned by using real-time functional MRI. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 102, 18626–18631. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0505210102>.

D'esposito, M., Detre, J.A., Aguirre, G.K., Stallcup, M., Alsop, D.C., Tippet, L.J., Farah, M.J., 1997. A functional MRI study of mental image generation. *Neuropsychologia* 35, 725–730.

Emmert, K., Breimhorst, M., Bauermann, T., Birkinle, F., Van De Ville, D., Haller, S., 2014. Comparison of anterior cingulate vs. insular cortex as targets for real-time fMRI regulation during pain stimulation. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* 8, 350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00350>.

Farb, N.A., Segal, Z.V., Mayberg, H., Bean, J., Mckee, D., Fatima, Z., Anderson, A.K., 2007. Attending to the present: mindfulness meditation reveals distinct neural modes of self-reference. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* 2, 313–322. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsm030>.

Frank, S., Lee, S., Preissl, H., Schultes, B., Birbaumer, N., Veit, R., 2012. The obese brain athlete: self-regulation of the anterior insula in adiposity. *PLoS One* 7, e42570. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042570>.

Greer, S.M., Trujillo, A.J., Glover, G.H., Knutson, B., 2014. Control of nucleus accumbens activity with neurofeedback. *Neuroimage* 96, 237–244. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.03.073>.

Greisus, M.D., Krasnow, B., Reiss, A.L., Menon, V., 2003. Functional connectivity in the resting brain: a network analysis of the default mode hypothesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 100, 253–258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0135058100>.

Haller, S., Birbaumer, N., Veit, R., 2010. Real-time fMRI feedback training may improve chronic tinnitus. *Eur. Radiol.* 20, 696–703. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00330-009-1595-z>.

Haller, S., Kopel, R., Jhooti, P., Haas, T., Scharnowski, F., Lovblad, K.O., Scheffler, K., Van De Ville, D., 2013. Dynamic reconfiguration of human brain functional networks through neurofeedback. *Neuroimage* 81, 243–252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.05.019>.

Hamilton, J.P., Glover, G.H., Hsu, J.J., Johnson, R.F., Gotlib, I.H., 2011. Modulation of subgenual anterior cingulate cortex activity with real-time neurofeedback. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 32, 22–31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20997>.

Hanakawa, T., Immisch, I., Toma, K., Dimyan, M.A., Van Gelderen, P., Hallett, M., 2003. Functional properties of brain areas associated with motor execution and imagery. *J. Neurophysiol.* 89, 989–1002. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1152/jn.00132.2002>.

Harmelech, T., Friedman, D., Malach, R., 2015. Differential magnetic resonance neurofeedback modulations across extrinsic (visual) and intrinsic (default-mode) nodes of the human cortex. *J. Neurosci.* 35, 2588–2595. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3098-14.2015>.

Hartwell, K.J., Prisciandaro, J.J., Borckardt, J., Li, X., George, M.S., Brady, K.T., 2013. Real-time fMRI in the treatment of nicotine dependence: a conceptual review and pilot studies. *Psychol. Addict. Behav.* 27, 501–509. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028215>.

Hollerman, J.R., Tremblay, L., Schultz, W., 1998. Influence of reward expectation on behavior-related neuronal activity in primate striatum. *J. Neurophysiol.* 80, 947–963.

Hui, M., Zhang, H., Ge, R., Yao, L., Long, Z., 2014. Modulation of functional network with real-time fMRI feedback training of right premotor cortex activity. *Neuropsychologia* 62, 111–123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2014.07.012>.

Johnson, K.A., Hartwell, K., Lematty, T., Borckardt, J., Morgan, P.S., Govindarajan, K., Brady, K., George, M.S., 2012. Intermittent “real-time” fMRI feedback is superior to

- continuous presentation for a motor imagery task: a pilot study. *J. Neuroimaging* 22, 58–66. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-6569.2010.00529.x>.
- Johnston, S., Linden, D.E., Healy, D., Goebel, R., Habes, I., Boehm, S.G., 2011. Upregulation of emotion areas through neurofeedback with a focus on positive mood. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci.* 11, 44–51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13415-010-0010-1>.
- Koechlin, E., Summerfield, C., 2007. An information theoretical approach to prefrontal executive function. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 11, 229–235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.04.005>.
- Laurienti, P.J., Burdette, J.H., Wallace, M.T., Yen, Y.F., Field, A.S., Stein, B.E., 2002. Deactivation of sensory-specific cortex by cross-modal stimuli. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 14, 420–429. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/089892902317361930>.
- Lawrence, E.J., Su, L., Barker, G.J., Medford, N., Dalton, J., Williams, S.C., Birbaumer, N., Veit, R., Ranganatha, S., Bodurka, J., Brammer, M., Giampietro, V., David, A.S., 2013. Self-regulation of the anterior insula: Reinforcement learning using real-time fMRI neurofeedback. *Neuroimage* 88C, 113–124. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.10.069>.
- Lee, J.H., Kim, J., Yoo, S.S., 2012. Real-time fMRI-based neurofeedback reinforces causality of attention networks. *Neurosci. Res.* 72, 347–354. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neures.2012.01.002>.
- Lehericy, S., Gerardin, E., 2002. Normal functional imaging of the basal ganglia. *Epileptic Disord.* 4 (Suppl. 3), S23–S30.
- Lerner, A., Bagic, A., Hanakawa, T., Boudreau, E.A., Pagan, F., Mari, Z., Bara-Jimenez, W., Aksu, M., Sato, S., Murphy, D.L., Hallett, M., 2009. Involvement of insula and cingulate cortices in control and suppression of natural urges. *Cereb. Cortex* 19, 218–223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhn074>.
- Levy, B.J., Wagner, A.D., 2011. Cognitive control and right ventrolateral prefrontal cortex: reflexive reorienting, motor inhibition, and action updating. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1224, 40–62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.05958.x>.
- Li, X., Hartwell, K.J., Borckardt, J., Prisciandaro, J.J., Saladin, M.E., Morgan, P.S., Johnson, K.A., Lematty, T., Brady, K.T., George, M.S., 2013. Volitional reduction of anterior cingulate cortex activity produces decreased cue craving in smoking cessation: a preliminary real-time fMRI study. *Addict. Biol.* 18, 739–748. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-1600.2012.00449.x>.
- Linden, D.E., Habes, I., Johnston, S.J., Linden, S., Tatineni, R., Subramanian, L., Sorger, B., Healy, D., Goebel, R., 2012. Real-time self-regulation of emotion networks in patients with depression. *PLoS One* 7, e38115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0038115>.
- Lotze, M., Halsband, U., 2006. Motor imagery. *J. Physiol. Paris* 99, 386–395. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jphysparis.2006.03.012>.
- Magno, E., Foxe, J.J., Molholm, S., Robertson, I.H., Garavan, H., 2006. The anterior cingulate and error avoidance. *J. Neurosci.* 26, 4769–4773. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0369-06.2006>.
- Mcorgan, C., 2012. A meta-analytic review of multisensory imagery identifies the neural correlates of modality-specific and modality-general imagery. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 6, 285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00285>.
- Menon, V., Uddin, L.Q., 2010. Saliency, switching, attention and control: a network model of insula function. *Brain Struct. Funct.* 214, 655–667. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00429-010-0262-0>.
- Miller, E.K., Cohen, J.D., 2001. An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* 24, 167–202. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.24.1.167>.
- Ninaus, M., Kober, S.E., Witte, M., Koschutnig, K., Stangl, M., Neuper, C., Wood, G., 2013. Neural substrates of cognitive control under the belief of getting neurofeedback training. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* 7, 914. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00914>.
- O'doherty, J.P., Dayan, P., Friston, K., Critchley, H., Dolan, R.J., 2003. Temporal difference models and reward-related learning in the human brain. *Neuron* 38, 329–337.
- Paret, C., Kluetsch, R., Ruf, M., Demirakca, T., Hoesterey, S., Ende, G., Schmahl, C., 2014. Down-regulation of amygdala activation with real-time fMRI neurofeedback in a healthy female sample. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* 8, 299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00299>.
- Posner, M.I., Rothbart, M.K., Sheese, B.E., Tang, Y., 2007. The anterior cingulate gyrus and the mechanism of self-regulation. *Cogn. Affect. Behav. Neurosci.* 7, 391–395.
- Posse, S., Fitzgerald, D., Gao, K., Habel, U., Rosenberg, D., Moore, G.J., Schneider, F., 2003. Real-time fMRI of temporolimbic regions detects amygdala activation during single-trial self-induced sadness. *Neuroimage* 18, 760–768.
- Raichle, M.E., Snyder, A.Z., 2007. A default mode of brain function: a brief history of an evolving idea. *Neuroimage* 37, 1083–1090. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2007.02.041> (discussion 1097–1089).
- Raichle, M.E., Macleod, A.M., Snyder, A.Z., Powers, W.J., Gusnard, D.A., Shulman, G.L., 2001. A default mode of brain function. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 98, 676–682. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.98.2.676>.
- Rance, M., Ruttorf, M., Nees, F., Schad, L.R., Flor, H., 2014. Real time fMRI feedback of the anterior cingulate and posterior insular cortex in the processing of pain. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.22585>.
- Robineau, F., Rieger, S.W., Mermoud, C., Pichon, S., Koush, Y., Van De Ville, D., Vuilleumier, P., Scharnowski, F., 2014. Self-regulation of inter-hemispheric visual cortex balance through real-time fMRI neurofeedback training. *Neuroimage* 100C, 1–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2014.05.072>.
- Rota, G., Sitaram, R., Veit, R., Erb, M., Weiskopf, N., Dogil, G., Birbaumer, N., 2009. Self-regulation of regional cortical activity using real-time fMRI: the right inferior frontal gyrus and linguistic processing. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 30, 1605–1614. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.20621>.
- Ruiz, S., Lee, S., Soekadar, S.R., Caria, A., Veit, R., Kircher, T., Birbaumer, N., Sitaram, R., 2013. Acquired self-control of insula cortex modulates emotion recognition and brain network connectivity in schizophrenia. *Hum. Brain Mapp.* 34, 200–212. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hbm.21427>.
- Ruiz, S., Buyukturkoglu, K., Rana, M., Birbaumer, N., Sitaram, R., 2014. Real-time fMRI brain computer interfaces: self-regulation of single brain regions to networks. *Biol. Psychol.* 95, 4–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2013.04.010>.
- Samejima, K., Ueda, Y., Doya, K., Kimura, M., 2005. Representation of action-specific reward values in the striatum. *Science* 310, 1337–1340. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1115270>.
- Schneider, F., Bermpohl, F., Heinzel, A., Rotte, M., Walter, M., Tempelmann, C., Wiebking, C., Dobrowolny, H., Heinze, H.J., Northoff, G., 2008. The resting brain and our self: self-relatedness modulates resting state neural activity in cortical midline structures. *Neuroscience* 157, 120–131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2008.08.014>.
- Shibata, K., Watanabe, T., Sasaki, Y., Kawato, M., 2011. Perceptual learning incepted by decoded fMRI neurofeedback without stimulus presentation. *Science* 334, 1413–1415. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1212003>.
- Smith, S.M., Jenkinson, M., Woolrich, M.W., Beckmann, C.F., Behrens, T.E., Johansen-Berg, H., Bannister, P.R., De Luca, M., Drobnjak, I., Flitney, D.E., Niaz, R.K., Saunders, J., Vickers, J., Zhang, Y., De Stefano, N., Brady, J.M., Matthews, P.M., 2004. Advances in functional and structural MR image analysis and implementation as FSL. *Neuroimage* 23 (Suppl. 1), S208–S219. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2004.07.051>.
- Sridharan, D., Levitin, D.J., Menon, V., 2008. A critical role for the right fronto-insular cortex in switching between central-executive and default-mode networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A* 105, 12569–12574. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0800005105>.
- Subramanian, L., Hindle, J.V., Johnston, S., Roberts, M.V., Husain, M., Goebel, R., Linden, D., 2011. Real-time functional magnetic resonance imaging neurofeedback for treatment of Parkinson's disease. *J. Neurosci.* 31, 16309–16317. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3498-11.2011>.
- Sulzer, J., Sitaram, R., Blefari, M.L., Kollias, S., Birbaumer, N., Stephan, K.E., Luft, A., Gassert, R., 2013. Neurofeedback-mediated self-regulation of the dopaminergic midbrain. *Neuroimage* 83, 817–825. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.05.115>.
- Veit, R., Singh, V., Sitaram, R., Caria, A., Rauss, K., Birbaumer, N., 2012. Using real-time fMRI to learn voluntary regulation of the anterior insula in the presence of threat-related stimuli. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* 7, 623–634. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsr061>.
- Watanabe, M., 1996. Reward expectancy in primate prefrontal neurons. *Nature* 382, 629–632. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/382629a0>.
- Weiskopf, N., Veit, R., Erb, M., Mathiak, K., Grodd, W., Goebel, R., Birbaumer, N., 2003. Physiological self-regulation of regional brain activity using real-time functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI): methodology and exemplary data. *Neuroimage* 19, 577–586.
- Woolrich, M.W., Behrens, T.E., Beckmann, C.F., Jenkinson, M., Smith, S.M., 2004. Multilevel linear modelling for fMRI group analysis using Bayesian inference. *Neuroimage* 21, 1732–1747. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2003.12.023>.
- Yin, H.H., Knowlton, B.J., 2006. The role of the basal ganglia in habit formation. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 7, 464–476. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrn1919>.
- Yoo, S.S., Jolesz, F.A., 2002. Functional MRI for neurofeedback: feasibility study on a hand motor task. *Neuroreport* 13, 1377–1381.
- Yoo, S.S., O'leary, H.M., Fairney, T., Chen, N.K., Panych, L.P., Park, H., Jolesz, F.A., 2006. Increasing cortical activity in auditory areas through neurofeedback functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Neuroreport* 17, 1273–1278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.wnr.0000227996.53540.22>.
- Young, K.D., Zotev, V., Phillips, R., Misaki, M., Yuan, H., Drevets, W.C., Bodurka, J., 2014. Real-time fMRI neurofeedback training of amygdala activity in patients with major depressive disorder. *PLoS One* 9, e88785. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0088785>.
- Zimmer, H.D., 2008. Visual and spatial working memory: from boxes to networks. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* 32, 1373–1395. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.05.016>.
- Zotev, V., Krueger, F., Phillips, R., Alvarez, R.P., Simmons, W.K., Bellgowan, P., Drevets, W.C., Bodurka, J., 2011. Self-regulation of amygdala activation using real-time fMRI neurofeedback. *PLoS One* 6, e24522. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0024522>.
- Zotev, V., Phillips, R., Young, K.D., Drevets, W.C., Bodurka, J., 2013. Prefrontal control of the amygdala during real-time fMRI neurofeedback training of emotion regulation. *PLoS One* 8, e79184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0079184>.