

Supplement

In addition to participants choices in the DST, we also analyzed the time it took them to move the mouse cursor over the chosen color patch (Figure S1). Patients OFF dopamine were overall slower than healthy controls ($p = .002$) and, marginally, than patients ON dopamine ($p = .066$). This difference remained constant over the course of a block (disease state \times trial number interaction: $p = .709$; drug state \times trial number interaction: $p = .183$) and testing sessions (disease state \times session interaction: $p = .952$; drug state \times session interaction: $p = .540$). Participants with higher scores in the Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT) responded faster in all groups (main effect SDMT: $p = .011$; disease state \times SDMT interaction: $p = .841$; drug state \times trial number interaction: $p = .426$). For full results see Table S1.

Predictor	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i> - value
Intercept	-0.015 (0.030)	.623
Disease State	-0.161 (0.050)	.002 **
Drug state	-0.047 (0.025)	.066
Trial number	-0.001 (0.001)	.016 *
Session	-0.039 (0.028)	.172
SDMT score	-0.064 (0.024)	.011 *
Disease state \times trial number	-0.001 (0.001)	.709
Drug state \times trial number	-0.001 (0.001)	.183
Disease state \times session	-0.002 (0.029)	.952
Drug state \times session	0.030 (0.049)	.540
Disease state \times SDMT score	0.011 (0.052)	.841
Drug state \times SDMT score	-0.018 (0.022)	.426

Table S1. Results of a Mixed-Effects Linear Regression predicting reaction times for color patch choices in the DST from disease state, drug state, trial number, session and SDMT score. SDMT = Symbol Digit Modalities Test; *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$




Fig S1. Choice reaction time in the free-choice blocks of the DST. Control participants were overall faster than PD patients, with patients OFF dopamine being slower than ON dopamine (a). The difference between medication state seemed to be weaker in session two (b). All participants became slightly faster in their choices across trials both overall (c) and in each session (d).

Given the prevalence of severe amotivation in PD and major depression (Husain & Roiser, 2018) as well as earlier reports suggesting a correlation between apathy ratings and reduced willingness to exert effort for reward (McGuigan et al., 2019), we also analyzed whether individual differences in the symptoms of apathy or depression, measured by the Apathy Evaluation Scale (AES) and the Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS), may predict choice behavior in the DST (Figure S2). However, we did not find a significant relation between questionnaire scores and effort avoidance in OFF patients (main effect AES: $p = .147$; main effect GDS: $p = .076$), ON patients (drug state \times AES: $p = .921$; drug state \times GDS: $p = .310$), or in healthy controls (disease state \times AES: $p = .091$; disease state \times GDS: $p = .453$). For full results see Table S2.

Predictor	AES			GDS	
	<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i> - value		<i>b</i> (<i>SE</i>)	<i>p</i> - value
Intercept	0.305 (0.114)	.007 *		0.285 (0.115)	.013 *
Disease state	-0.112 (0.149)	.451		-0.074 (0.152)	.626
Drug state	-0.464 (0.157)	.003 **		-0.452 (0.159)	.005 **
Trial type	0.001 (0.004)	.695		0.002 (0.004)	.679
Session	0.005 (0.110)	.963		-0.013 (0.111)	.908
Questionnaire score	-0.140 (0.096)	.147		0.182 (0.102)	.076
Disease state × trial number	0.001 (0.006)	.905		0.001 (0.006)	.898
Drug state × trial number	0.009 (0.003)	.001 **		0.009 (0.003)	.001 **
Disease state × session	0.020 (0.150)	.894		-0.020 (0.148)	.891
Drug state × session	-0.119 (0.142)	.400		-0.123 (0.146)	.397
Disease state × questionnaire score	0.230 (0.136)	.091		-0.112 (0.149)	.453
Drug state × questionnaire score	0.014 (0.137)	.921		-0.145 (0.143)	.310

Table S2. Results of a Mixed-Effects Logistic Regression predicting proportion of choices according to instructions in the forced-choice blocks of the DST from disease state, drug state, trial number, session, and questionnaire scores. AES = Apathy Evaluation Scale, GDS = Geriatric Depression Scale; *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$




Fig S2. Relationship between questionnaire scores and effort avoidance. Individual differences in symptoms of apathy (a) and depression (b) do not predict proportions of low-demand choices. AES = Apathy Evaluation Scale. GDS = Geriatric Depression Scale.

References

- Husain, M., & Roiser, J. P. (2018). Neuroscience of apathy and anhedonia: A transdiagnostic approach. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *19*(8), 470.
- McGuigan, S., Zhou, S.-H., Brosnan, M. B., Thyagarajan, D., Bellgrove, M. A., & Chong, T. T. (2019). Dopamine restores cognitive motivation in Parkinson's disease. *Brain*, *142*(3), 719–732.