



PEARL

Neural correlates of evidence accumulation during value-based decisions revealed via simultaneous EEG-fMRI

Pisauro, M. Andrea; Fouragnan, Elsa; Retzler, Chris; Philiastides, Marios G.

Published in:

Nature Communications

DOI:

[10.1038/ncomms15808](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15808)

Publication date:

2017

Link:

[Link to publication in PEARL](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Pisauro, M. A., Fouragnan, E., Retzler, C., & Philiastides, M. G. (2017). Neural correlates of evidence accumulation during value-based decisions revealed via simultaneous EEG-fMRI. *Nature Communications*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15808>

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Wherever possible please cite the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

Neural correlates of evidence accumulation during value-based decisions revealed via simultaneous EEG-fMRI

M. Andrea Pisauro¹, Elsa Fouragnan^{1,2}, Chris Retzler^{1,3} and Marios G. Philiastides^{1*}

Affiliations:

¹Institute of Neuroscience and Psychology, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

²Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

³Department of Behavioural & Social Sciences, University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, UK

Corresponding author:

Marios Philiastides

University of Glasgow

Institute of Neuroscience and Psychology

58 Hillhead Street, Glasgow, G12 8QB, UK

marios.philiastides@glasgow.ac.uk

Abstract

Current computational accounts posit that in simple binary choices humans accumulate evidence in favor of the different alternatives before committing to a decision. Neural correlates of this accumulating activity have been found during perceptual decisions in parietal and prefrontal cortex; however the source of such activity in value-based choices remains unknown. Here we used simultaneous EEG-fMRI and computational modeling to identify EEG signals reflecting an accumulation process and found that trial-by-trial variability in these signals explains fMRI responses in posterior-medial frontal cortex. Consistent with integrating the evidence for the decision, this region also exhibits task-dependent coupling with the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and the striatum, brain areas known to encode the subjective value of the decision alternatives. These results further endorse the proposition of an evidence accumulation process during value-based decisions in humans and implicate the posterior-medial frontal cortex in this process.

Introduction

Many decisions in life are based on personal preferences. For example when ordering a dessert at a restaurant, one needs to decide whether one prefers chocolate cake or ice cream. What is the mechanism and source of this deliberation process and how does it differ from decisions based primarily on perceptual evidence (i.e. choosing the larger of the items)?

Perceptual decisions are typically characterized both computationally and experimentally in terms of an integrative mechanism whereby information supporting different decision alternatives accumulates over time until an internal decision boundary is reached¹⁻⁴. Evidence supporting this mechanism comes from recent electroencephalography (EEG) studies in humans, which report that electrical activity measured at the scalp builds up gradually in time during perceptual decisions⁵⁻⁹, and from fMRI studies, which propose that this activity is generated in sensorimotor and higher-level prefrontal areas¹⁰⁻¹⁵. Recent modelling studies also implicate this integrative mechanism in value-based choices¹⁶⁻¹⁸ proposing that evidence accumulation could represent a domain-general decision processing stage^{1,19-21}. However, direct evidence of such accumulating activity in the human brain during value-based decision making is still lacking.

A recent EEG study provided the first evidence of a gradual build-up of activity (in the gamma frequency band) consistent with an accumulation process in a value-based decision making task²². Due to the diffuse and macroscopic nature of scalp potentials, however, the source of such activity remains unknown²³. We hypothesize that if the relevant accumulator regions in the brain exist, then an electrophysiologically-derived measure of the process of evidence accumulation should covary on a trial-by-trial basis with activity in these regions.

To test this hypothesis, we coupled high temporal resolution, single-trial, EEG with simultaneously acquired functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI)^{24,25} and computational modeling to (1) uncover the process of evidence accumulation in the broadband EEG signal and (2) confirm its

presence by localizing its source with fMRI during value-based decision making.

We found a robust accumulating activity in centro-parietal EEG electrodes and found that trial-by-trial variability in this activity explained fMRI responses in posterior-medial frontal cortex. This region was further showing task-dependent coupling with the ventromedial prefrontal cortex and the striatum, supporting the hypothesis of an evidence accumulation process in human pmFC underlying a range of value-based decisions.

Results

Sequential sampling modelling fit behavior and identifies EEG accumulating activity

We asked twenty-one hungry participants to choose between pairs of previously rated snack items and indicate their choice with a button press (Fig. 1a). The value difference in the ratings of the presented items controlled the overall difficulty of the decision. On average, accuracy (choosing the item with the highest rating) increased and reaction times (RT) decreased as the value difference of the items increased (Fig. 1b; Accuracy: $t(20) = 15.7$, $P < 0.001$; RT: $t(20) = -3.95$, $P < 0.001$; t -test on the slopes of the correlation with VD).

We fitted a dynamical sequential sampling model (that assumes a leaky accumulation-to-bound process)²⁶ to the behavioral data of each individual participant (Accuracy: $r = 0.96$, $t(83) = 31.0$, $P < 0.001$; RT: $r = 0.91$, $t(83) = 19.9$, $P < 0.001$; Supplementary Fig. 1a-c) to generate predictions for the average individual temporal profiles of the underlying evidence accumulation activity (Fig. 1c and Supplementary Fig. 1d). We used these predictions to identify clusters of EEG activity, which exhibited accumulation-like dynamics leading up to the decision time (Fig. 1c; Methods). We found one such cluster encompassing a set of midline centroparietal electrodes the activity of which correlated significantly with the model predictions ($r = 0.68 \pm 0.15$, $t(188) = 30.9$, $P < 0.001$, average correlation across all subjects and electrodes in the cluster; $r = 0.90 \pm 0.07$, $t(20) = 61.9$, $P < 0.001$, average correlation across all subject-specific highest correlated electrodes within the cluster; Fig. 1c inset).

Control analyses revealed that this accumulation activity was, on average, modulated by response times (slower accumulation for longer RTs) and task difficulty (slower accumulation in more difficult trials) and was reaching a common boundary at time of decision (Supplementary Fig. 2a-b). Moreover, the quality of the evidence accumulation predicted individual behavioral performance, whereby participants with higher average accumulation rates exhibited better overall performance (higher accuracy) on the task (Supplementary Fig. 2c). To rule out that the observed build-up of activity was driven by the perceptual processing of the stimuli as such, we ran a separate EEG experiment in which participants passively viewed pairs of the same stimuli used in our main value-based task (i.e. a task in which a decision was no longer required). We found that the same sensors capturing a gradual build-up of activity in the value task, no longer exhibited an accumulation-like profile (Supplementary Figure 3a-b). Taken together, these results suggest that our original evidence accumulation activity likely reflects a true decision-related signal.

EEG accumulating activity correlates with posterior medial frontal cortex fMRI activity

Having established a concrete link between EEG activity and evidence accumulation, we used the signal in subject-specific electrode in the centroparietal cluster exhibiting the highest correlation with the model's prediction (we will refer to them as 'best' electrodes throughout the text; Supplementary Fig. 1e) to provide an electrophysiologically-derived *trial-by-trial* representation of the temporal dynamics of the process of evidence accumulation. We exploited this endogenous variability to build EEG-informed fMRI predictors to identify whether and where the accumulation process is encoded in the brain. Specifically, for each trial we used the raw EEG time-series in the time interval over which the process of evidence accumulation unfolded (see Methods) to parametrically modulate our fMRI regressor amplitudes (Fig. 2a). We note that trials with lower accumulation rates that require prolonged integration times to reach the decision boundary will have larger areas under the accumulation process²⁷. This is consistent with a negative relationship between the slope of evidence accumulation and the hemodynamic response in the relevant areas^{14,28} (see²⁹ for a good discussion

on the relationship between the drift rate of the accumulation and the associated BOLD response). Correspondingly, brain region(s) reflecting evidence accumulation should appear more hemodynamically active in trials with longer compared to shorter integration times (Fig. 2b).

Crucially, the slopes of this accumulating activity were not *strongly* predictive of individual RTs ($r = -0.13$, $P < 0.005$), due to the high degree of inter-trial variability in the decision and motor planning stages (i.e. due to the stochastic nature of these processes). Sequential sampling models of speeded decision making have shown that as a consequence of this variability the shortest RTs end up being approximately the same across all rates of evidence accumulation, with the longest RTs being somewhat more predictive of the accumulation rate (i.e. increase as accumulation rates decrease)^{30,31}. Correlating separately short and long RT trial groups in our task (by a medial split on RTs) with the individual trial slopes of our EEG activity led to the same observation ($r = -0.06$, $P = 0.95$, for short RTs; $r = -0.21$, $P < 0.001$; for long RTs) suggesting that individual RTs cannot be used to reliably index the rate of evidence accumulation for individual trials (Supplementary Fig. 4a). Finally, we also showed that the slopes of our accumulating EEG activity were independent from trial-by-trial fluctuations in attention, as indexed by pre-stimulus EEG power in the α -band³² and further confirmed by the absence of a serial autocorrelation in slopes across neighboring trials (Supplementary Fig. 4b). Nonetheless, to account for these potentially confounding processes we included separate fMRI predictors for early visual processing, choice/task difficulty and RTs (Fig. 2a; Methods).

Using this fMRI analysis design, we found a cluster in posterior medial frontal cortex (pmFC) that was uniquely covarying with the trial-by-trial variability in our EEG-derived predictor ($Z > 2.57$, cluster corrected using a resampling procedure – see Methods; Fig. 2c; Supplementary Table 1), implicating this region in the process of evidence accumulation in value-based choices. Critically, in a supplementary analysis, the EEG variability in short RT trials (those in which the rate of evidence accumulation is entirely decoupled from the RTs as indicated above) continued to be predictive of activity in the pmFC (Supplementary Fig. 4c-d), further confirming that this region is driven primarily

by the trial-by-trial dynamics of the process of evidence accumulation rather than motor preparation and execution as such. Correspondingly, the pMFC was not observed in the remaining fMRI regressors, indicating that our electrophysiologically-derived predictor offered additional explanatory power than what was already conferred by our stimulus and behaviorally derived regressors (paired t-tests, all $P < 0.05$). Instead, the latter regressors exposed other areas associated with stimulus/value processing, task difficulty and motor execution, consistent with previous reports on value-based decision making (Supplementary Table 1) ³³.

pMFC is functionally coupled with valuation system and also active in reward-based task

We reasoned that if the pMFC is indeed related to a process of value-based evidence accumulation, it should additionally show a task-dependent connectivity pattern with regions of the human valuation system ²⁸ that are known to encode the relevant evidence used in the decision (i.e. the absolute difference in value between the two decision alternatives) ^{28,34,35}. We therefore hypothesize that the coupling with pMFC should be negative, as high value differences decrease integration times and correspondingly the overall integrated activity ³⁶ (i.e. area under accumulation curve; Fig. 2b). To this end we ran a psychophysiological interaction analysis with the pMFC as seed. This analysis revealed a significant negative coupling (by value difference in the decision period) between the pMFC and two clusters in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) and the striatum (STR, Fig. 2d), both of which have repeatedly been implicated in valuation ^{35,37-39} and were indeed modulated by value difference in our task (Supplementary Table 1). Intriguingly, this finding is corroborated by recent resting-state connectivity reports showing negative BOLD correlations between regions of the pMFC and ventromedial prefrontal and orbitofrontal cortices ⁴⁰.

To test whether this region accumulates evidence independent of the task at hand, we ran a separate EEG-fMRI experiment using a probabilistic reward-based decision making task ²⁴ (with the same participants and setup, Supplementary Figure 5a). This experiment produced an independent dataset to validate the presence of an accumulation-like activity in the same (“best”) EEG electrodes that

exhibited such activity in our original preference-based choice task. Using this new dataset we found a comparable build-up of activity in the EEG (Supplementary Figure 5b) that was also predictive of fMRI responses in the pMFC (Supplementary Figure 5c). These findings suggest that a process of evidence accumulation drives a range of value- and reward-based decisions and that pMFC might be a common module for driving this process.

Discussion

We combined computational modelling and simultaneous recordings of EEG and fMRI to identify a cortical area in pMFC reflecting evidence accumulation during value-based decisions. We further showed that during decision formation this area was functionally coupled with brain regions of the human valuation system while it continued to exhibit accumulation-like dynamics during an independent reward-based decision making task. Taken together, these results support the hypothesis of an evidence accumulation process in human pMFC underlying a range of value-based decisions.

Recent modeling and stand-alone fMRI studies have made significant progress in establishing a link between value-based decisions and an accumulation-to-bound mechanism^{16,18,27,28,41–43}. The majority of these studies, however, used indirect stimulus- or model-derived correlates of evidence accumulation that do not necessarily reflect *endogenous* trial-by-trial variability in information processing, which has been shown to offer additional explanatory power in analyzing functional brain imaging data and exposing latent brain states^{24,44,45}.

A fundamental feature of human decision-making is that our responses are variable in the choices we make and in the time it takes for us to make them, even when we are faced with identical decisions on repeated occasions. Computational models of decision-making often consider this variability when estimating internal components of processing (e.g. accumulation rates). However, most models only produce estimates of the mean and variance of the relevant decision variables across many trials with only a few recent studies attempting to derive single-trial parameter estimates^{46–48} of such variables.

The novelty of our work stems from the fact that we captured this trial-by-trial variability by capitalizing instead on an electrophysiologically-derived (i.e. endogenous) signal of evidence accumulation and by exploiting the moment-by-moment changes in this signal as the decision process unfolds (i.e. we exploited variability both within and across trials). While we used a computational model to select and constrain which features (electrodes, time window) of the EEG data to consider, our approach differs from conventional model-based fMRI in that we don't make any *a priori* assumptions about which characteristic of the EEG response is relevant (e.g. the slope or the boundary of the accumulation) but rather consider the full temporal dynamics of the decision process to capture *all* relevant variability which could potentially explain the fMRI signal. In other words, our approach allowed us to effectively consider both the drift (i.e. the drift rate) and the diffusion (i.e. the noise) part of the decision process to identify the spatial locus of evidence accumulation in value-based decisions.

Our EEG measure of evidence accumulation arose from a cluster of centroparietal electrodes which have also been found to encode decision signals in a wide variety of perceptual tasks and sensory modalities ^{5,6,8,49,50}. Correspondingly, we ran a supplementary EEG experiment in which participants performed perceptual judgments (i.e. which item is larger) using pairs of the same stimuli used in our original value-based task and found analogous accumulation dynamics in the same EEG electrode cluster (Supplementary Figure 3). Such supramodal signals are understood to be a signature of the formation of perceptual decisions and are thought to be closely related to the classic P300 ^{6,51}. While we cannot rule out the possibility that additional sources contribute to the generation of this EEG signature ⁵², our results suggest that the involvement of pMFC in decision formation might span both perceptual and value-based decisions.

The cluster in pMFC we identified here lies on the medial surface of the juxtapositional lobule cortex ⁵³ and extends ventrally to the cingulate cortex bilaterally ^{54,55}. These subdivisions cover the caudal part of Brodmann's area 6 and 24 respectively ^{55,56} and are commonly referred to as Supplementary

Motor Area (SMA) ⁵⁷ and posterior Mid-Cingulate Cortex (pMCC). Both of these areas are traditionally thought to be involved in motor control and preparation of voluntary actions but their precise function remains elusive ⁵⁸⁻⁶¹.

More recently, these regions were linked to a wide range of other functional roles ^{59,62} ranging from learning of stimulus-response associations ⁶³, reward prediction error processing ^{64,65} time perception even in the absence of overt motor responses ⁶⁶, and value comparison ⁶⁷. Correspondingly, bidirectional connections between the SMA and the pMCC were also reported ^{68,69} suggesting these areas might act as a single functional unit in a wide variety of tasks ⁷⁰⁻⁷³. Intriguingly, a region partially overlapping with our cluster in the pMFC (including adjacent structures such as the pre-SMA) has also been implicated in adjusting decision boundaries during perceptual evidence accumulation ⁷⁴⁻⁷⁶.

Therefore, one potential alternative interpretation of our findings is that the activity in this area is related instead to trial-by-trial boundary adjustments. To investigate this further, we computed EEG-derived single-trial boundaries (i.e. EEG amplitude differences between the onset and offset of accumulation) and we included these estimates as an additional predictor in a separate fMRI analysis. We found that the activation in the pMFC remained attached to our original EEG regressor capturing the full temporal dynamics of the decision process rather than being absorbed by the new decision boundary regressor (Supplementary Figure 4e). We view these results as additional evidence that the region of the pMFC we reported here cannot be explained purely based on boundary adjustments but rather by considering the decision dynamics as a whole. As such this region appears different both in location and functional role from those reported in the perceptual decision making literature.

Taken together, our findings raise the interesting possibility that, at least under conditions of increased urgency to commit to a choice, decisions are encoded in the same sensorimotor areas guiding the actions which implement that choice (here in pMFC). Many electrophysiological and neuroimaging studies of perceptual decision making in humans and monkeys have found choice-predictive activity

consistent with an accumulation of sensory evidence in motor⁷⁷ and sensorimotor areas^{12,78,79}, consistent with this interpretation. Our results suggest that a similar mechanism might also operate during value-based decisions whereby activity in pMFC might reflect an increased tendency to select the appropriate motor response. In turn, this tendency could integrate the evidence about the value of the different options encoded in the human valuation system, which appears to be functionally coupled with pMFC before decisions.

In conclusion, our results provide critical new insights regarding the role of pMFC in value-based decision making, complementing previous reports that have implicated this region in perceptual decisions^{14,74–76}. Our general research approach of combining computational modeling with simultaneous EEG/fMRI recordings opens up new avenues for a more targeted investigation of the neural systems underlying value-based decision making in humans. Our findings also have the potential to further improve our understanding of how everyday decisions can sometimes go astray and how such maladaptive behaviors can affect reward learning and strategic planning.

Methods

Participants Twenty-four subjects participated in the experiment. Three were removed for excessive head movements inside the scanner. The remaining subjects (8 males, 13 females), aged between 18–31 years (mean = 22 years, s.d.± 2.5), were included in all subsequent analyses. They were all right handed, had normal or corrected-to-normal vision and reported no history of psychiatric, neurological or major medical problems, and were free of psychoactive medications at the time of the study. Written informed consent was obtained in accordance with the School of Psychology Ethics Committee at the University of Nottingham.

Stimuli and behavioral task The behavioral task consisted of two steps: (1) a rating phase (outside of the MR scanner) and (2) a speeded two-choice decision-making task (inside the MR scanner). In the rating phase, we asked participants to provide a subjective value rating for 80 different snack items. Before providing the ratings, subjects briefly saw all of the items for an effective use of the rating scale. Participants indicated how much they liked to eat each snack using an on-screen Likert scale ranging from -5 (really dislike) to 5 (really like) with unitary increments.

The main decision-making task followed shortly thereafter (Fig. 1a). Trials started with the presentation of a central fixation cross (subtending $0.6^\circ \times 0.6^\circ$ of visual angle) that served as an inter-stimulus interval (ISI: in the range of 2-4s). Subjects were instructed to focus on the central fixation. Following the ISI two food items were simultaneously displayed to the left and to the right of the fixation cross (subtending $\sim 3^\circ \times 3^\circ$ of visual angle) for 1.25s and participants were asked to respond within this time period and indicate the item they preferred the most. Participants indicated their choice by pressing the left or right button on a fORP MRI compatible response box (Current Design Inc., Philadelphia, PA, USA) using their right index or middle finger, respectively. After making a choice, the fixation cross dimmed briefly (100 ms) to signal successful registration of the response. Trials in which participants failed to respond within 1.25 s of stimulus presentation were followed by a 'lost trial' message and were excluded from further analysis. There was no cost for lost trials and overall these were extremely rare (<1% of all trials). We defined a correct response as a choice in which the subject selected the item with the highest rating. Participants were required to maintain fixation throughout the trial.

We manipulated the difficulty of the task by controlling the Value Difference (VD) between the two presented items (based on the original subject-specific ratings). We constructed random pairs of items and constrained the VD to one of four possible levels [1, 2, 3, 4]. We note that across participants the VD of all items pairs was virtually decoupled (zero correlation) from subtle perceptual differences in the stimuli, such as differences in size, luminance or contrast. Each experiment consisted of 400 trials

(100 trials per VD level) divided in two blocks of 200 trials each. Trials were presented in a fully interleaved fashion. Participants were instructed to refrain from eating in the 3 hours leading up to the experiment and were told that one of their item choices during the main task would be randomly selected for them to consume in the lab at the end of the experiment. To test whether VD modulated behavior we computed subject-specific linear regression coefficients for VD vs Accuracy and VD vs RT and performed separate two-tailed t-tests on these coefficients.

The fixation cross and the stimuli were equated for luminance and contrast. A Windows Professional 7, 64 bit-based machine (3 GB RAM) with an nVidia (Santa Clara, CA) graphics card and Presentation software (Neurobehavioral Systems Inc., Albany, CA) controlled the stimulus display. An EPSON EMP-821 projector (refresh rate: 60 Hz, resolution: 1280 x 1024 pixels) projected the images onto a screen, which was placed 2.3 m from the subject (projection screen size: 120 x 90 cm).

Sequential sampling modeling Following a recent study²² we modeled Evidence Accumulation (EA) as a Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process , which represents a special case of the leaky competing accumulator family of models²⁶. This process is described by the equation:

$$EA(t + 1) = EA(t) + (\lambda \times EA(t) + k VD)dt + N(0, \sigma) \quad (1)$$

where VD is the Value Difference which drives the accumulation (i.e., difference in value between the food items), k is a parameter that modulates the input, λ is a parameter that denotes the leak strength (or acceleration to threshold) of the process and $N(0, \sigma)$ is a Gaussian noise term with standard deviation σ . We used $dt = 0.001$ s and assumed that the model makes a decision when $|EA| > 1$ (i.e. setting the decision threshold for a correct and error response to + 1 and – 1 respectively; Supplementary Fig. 1a). We accounted for early visual encoding of the stimuli and motor preparation by adding a non-decision time nDT (a free parameter in the model) to the time taken to reach the threshold. The model was fitted to the individual participants' RT data (Supplementary Fig. 1b) using a maximum likelihood estimation. Specifically, RTs were separated into correct and error trials for each of the four VD levels. RTs from correct and incorrect trials were then combined into a single

distribution by mirroring the distribution of incorrect trials at the zero point along the time dimension, so that all the times in this distribution received a negative sign⁸⁰. This RT distribution and participants' choice accuracies were compared to the RT distribution and proportion of correct choices generated by the model. For a given set of parameter estimates, we estimated the log likelihood (LL) of the data using the following formula:

$$LL \sim \sum_{VD=1}^4 \log(KS(RT_{data}^{VD}, RT_{model}^{VD})) + \sum_{VD=1}^4 \log(\exp\left(-\left(\frac{Accuracy_{data}^{VD} - Accuracy_{model}^{VD}}{0.1}\right)^2\right)) \quad (2)$$

where $KS(p,q)$ estimates the probability that two distributions are equal according to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (computed using MATLAB function *kstest2* which estimates the predicted cumulative probability through the proportions of the predicted RTs which are less than or equal to any observed RT), VD represents a given difficulty level and accuracies are computed as proportion of correct response for the data and the model for each difficulty level. For each participant separately, we identified the set of model parameters that maximized the log likelihood, by searching over a grid of values: $\lambda = [2.5, 3.0, \dots, 7, 7.5]$, $k = [0.02, 0.04, \dots, 0.4]$, $\sigma = [0.003, 0.006, \dots, 0.024]$ and $nDT = [0.1, 0.15, \dots, 0.6]$ s. These ranges were defined after an initial exploratory analysis over a wider range of parameter values to ensure selecting the ones that produced choice accuracies spanning those seen in behavior. For each set of parameters we generated RT distributions and choice accuracies by running 5,000 simulations of the model (i.e. by producing decision trajectories using Eq. 1) for each difficulty level. To further assess the quality of the fits resulting from the best set of subject-specific parameters (those that maximized the LL function in Eq. 2), we computed correlation coefficients between the average accuracy and RT from the data and the model for all participants and VD levels. We also performed a separate parameter recovery analysis⁸¹ to ensure that the parameters of our SSM were estimated reliably (Supplementary Figure 6 and Supplementary Methods).

Next, we applied the best set of subject-specific parameters to generate individual participants' model-predicted EA signals (Supplementary Fig. 1c) by averaging activity of all the simulated trials time-locked to the decision, starting -1.25 s before the decision threshold is crossed. If the response time of the model was shorter than 1.25 s, then we padded the beginning of the trial with null values (i.e.,

these values did not contribute to the average across simulated trials). Averages of model-predicted activity were quantitatively tested against average EEG response-triggered traces for each participant individually (see below in the 'EEG data analysis' subsection).

Finally, we note that we also tested alternative SSM models, which either included an additional threshold parameter θ to account for potential variability in the decision boundary across participants (see Supplementary Methods) or excluded the leak term λ all together. However, these alternative models did not provide a better fit to the data compared to our original model (Supplementary Figure 6). For the former this is likely due the difficulty of identifying the threshold parameter θ together with drift rate and noise while for the latter due to the exponential nature of the evidence accumulation signal (Suppl. Figure 4e). Critically, however, since we are using the EEG signal itself as a regressor for the fMRI analysis we ensured that potential misspecifications in the model have a lesser influence on the eventual inference.

EEG data collection EEG data was acquired at a 5-kHz sampling rate at the same time as the fMRI data collection, using an MR-compatible EEG amplifier system (BrainAmps MR-Plus, Brain Products, Germany) and the Brain Vision Recorder software (BVR; Version 1.10, Brain Products, Germany). Data were filtered online with a hardware band-pass filter of 0.016–250 Hz. The EEG cap included 64 Ag/AgCl scalp electrodes which were localized according to the international 10–20 system. The reference electrode was positioned between electrode Fpz and Fz while the ground electrode was positioned between electrode Pz and Oz. All electrodes had in-line 10 k Ω surface-mount resistors to ensure subject safety. All leads were bundled together and twisted for their entire length to minimize inductive pick-up and maximize participant's safety. Input impedances were kept below 20 k Ω (including the 10 k Ω surface-mount resistors on each electrode). EEG data acquisition was synchronized with the fMRI data (Syncbox, Brain Products, Germany) and triggers from the MR-scanner were collected separately to remove MR gradient artifacts offline. Scanner trigger pulses were lengthened to 50 μ s using an in-house pulse stretcher to facilitate accurate capture by the BVR.

Experimental event codes were also synchronized with the EEG data and collected using the BVR software. MR gradient artifacts were minimized by ensuring that electrodes Fp1 and Fp2 were at the isocentre of the MR scanner in the z-direction (by aligning these two electrodes with the laser beam used to place the participants inside the bore). We used a 32-channel SENSE head coil which presented an access port at the top of participants head, allowing the EEG cap cables to run along a straight path out of the scanner. This manipulation ensured no wire loops, thus minimizing the risk of RF heating of the EEG cap and associated cables and of inducing EEG artifacts. To additionally minimize induced artifacts, the cabling was isolated from scanner vibrations as much as possible, through the use of a cantilevered beam⁸².

EEG pre-processing We performed EEG pre-processing offline using MATLAB (Mathworks, Natick, MA). EEG signals recorded inside an MR scanner are contaminated with gradient and ballistocardiogram (BCG) artifacts due to magnetic induction on the EEG leads. We first removed the gradient artifacts. Specifically, from each functional volume acquisition we subtracted the average artifact template constructed using the 80 volumes centered on the volume-of-interest using in-house MATLAB software. We repeated this process for as many times as there were functional volumes in our data sets. We subsequently applied a 10-ms median filter to remove any residual spike artifacts. Next, we band-pass filtered the data by applying a 0.5-Hz high-pass filter to remove DC drifts and a 40 Hz low-pass filter to remove high frequency artifacts not associated with neurophysiological processes of interest. These filters were applied together, non-causally to avoid distortions caused by phase delays.

BCG artifacts share frequency content with the EEG and as such are more challenging to remove. To avoid loss of signal power in the underlying EEG we adopted a conservative approach and removed a small number of BCG components using principal component analysis in two steps. Firstly, four BCG principal components were extracted from data that were initially low-pass filtered at 4 Hz to extract the signal within the frequency range where BCG artifacts are observed. Secondly, the sensor

weightings corresponding to those components were projected onto the broadband (original) data and subtracted out.

Eye-movement artifact removal Before the beginning of the fMRI acquisition, participants performed an eye-movement calibration task during which they were asked to blink repeatedly on the appearance of a fixation cross in the middle of the screen and to make several horizontal and vertical saccades by following a fixation cross moving right to left and up and down on the screen, respectively. The fixation cross subtended $0.6^\circ \times 0.6^\circ$ of visual angle while the horizontal and vertical saccades subtended 30° and 22° respectively. Using principal component analysis we determined linear EEG sensor weightings corresponding to these eye blinks and saccades, which we then projected onto the broadband data from the main task and subtracted out.

EEG data analysis We computed EEG response-triggered traces for all subjects and electrodes by averaging together all trials in the interval ranging from 700 ms before to 200 ms after response time. We excluded noisy trials in which more than ten electrodes had an average trial amplitude above 2 standard deviations from the grand mean across electrodes in the time range above (on average, we removed $< 5\%$ of the total number of trials). In order to identify clusters of EEG activity that exhibited accumulation-like dynamics we regressed these EEG traces (for each participant individually) against the subject-specific average model-predicted EA response (Eq. 1; Supplementary Fig. 1c). For this analysis, we focused on a time window starting 600 ms prior to the response (when build-up of activity started, on average, to unfold) and lasting until 100 ms before the response. We also estimated individual trial EEG slopes (using trial-specific time windows) for a separate EEG-informed fMRI analysis (see 'fMRI analysis' section below for details). We purposely excluded the last 100 ms leading up to the response to avoid potential confounds with activity related to motor execution (due to a sudden increase in corticospinal excitability in this period⁸³). We selected electrodes, which survived a one-sample two-sided t-test of the population of regression coefficients computed individually above, with a significance level of 0.05 (Bonferroni-corrected by the number of EEG

electrodes). We considered clusters comprising of at least three significant neighboring electrodes. This analysis led to the identification of a cluster of nine midline centroparietal electrodes.

We computed correlations between the activity of each of these electrodes and the evidence accumulation profile produced by the model by considering the average response-locked EEG activity for each individual subject. We used this approach to identify subject-specific “best” sensors (i.e. those with the highest correlation) and computed the average highest sensor correlation across participants. We also computed the average correlation in the entire centroparietal electrode cluster by averaging the data/model correlations across all participants and electrodes in the cluster. To build subject-specific fMRI predictors of the process of evidence accumulation (see subsection on fMRI analyses below) we used, for each participant, the “best” electrode within this cluster that showed the highest correlation with the model’s EA response (Supplementary Fig. 1d,e).

MRI data collection We acquired the fMRI data using a 3 T Philips Achieva MRI scanner (Philips, Netherlands). Specifically, we collected functional Echo-Planar-Imaging (EPI) data using an 32-channel SENSE head coil with an anterior–posterior fold over direction (SENSE factor: 2.3; repetition time: 2.5 s; echo time: 40 ms; number of slices: 40; number of voxels: 68 × 68; in-plane resolution: 3 × 3 mm; slice thickness: 3 mm; flip angle: 80°). Slices were collected in an interleaved order. Altogether, we collected two separate runs of 317 volumes each, corresponding to the two blocks of trials in the main experimental task. Anatomical images were acquired using a MPRAGE T1-weighted sequence that yielded images with a 1 × 1 × 1 mm resolution (160 slices; number of voxels: 256 × 256; repetition time: 8.2 ms; echo time: 3.7 ms). We also acquired a B0 map using a multi-shot gradient echo sequence which was subsequently used to correct for distortions in the EPI data due to B0 inhomogeneities (echo time: 2.3 ms; delta echo time: 5 ms; isotropic resolution: 3 mm; matrix: 68 × 68 × 32; repetition time: 383 ms; flip angle: 90°).

fMRI pre-processing We discarded the first ten volumes from each fMRI run in order to ensure T1 equilibration effects, and we used the remaining 307 volumes for the statistical analysis presented in this study. Pre-processing of our data was performed using the FMRIB's Software Library (Functional MRI of the Brain, Oxford, UK)⁸⁴ and included: head-related motion correction, slice-timing correction, high-pass filtering (>100 s), and spatial smoothing (with a Gaussian kernel of 8 mm full-width at half maximum). To register our EPI image to standard space, we first transformed the EPI images into each individual's high-resolution space with a linear six-parameter rigid body transformation. We then registered the image to standard space (Montreal Neurological Institute, MNI) using FMRIB's Non-linear Image Registration Tool with a resolution warp of 10 mm. Finally, B0 unwarping was applied to correct for signal loss and geometric distortions due to B0 field inhomogeneities in the EPI images.

fMRI analyses We performed whole-brain statistical analyses of functional data using a multilevel approach within the Generalized Linear Model (GLM) framework, as implemented in FSL⁸⁴ through the FEAT module:

$$Y = X\beta + \varepsilon = \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

where Y is the times series of a given voxel comprising T time samples and X is a $T \times 4$ design matrix (Fig. 2a) with columns representing four different regressors (see below) convolved with a canonical hemodynamic response function (double- γ function). β is a 4×1 column vector of regression coefficients and ε a $T \times 1$ column vector of residual error terms. We performed a first-level analysis to analyze each participant's individual runs, which were then combined using a second-level analysis (fixed effects). Finally, we used a third-level, mixed-effects model (FLAME 1) to combine data across subjects, treating participants as a random effect. Time-series statistical analysis was carried out using FMRIB's improved linear model with local autocorrelation correction.

Our GLM model included an EEG-informed regressor capturing the trial-by-trial dynamics of the process of evidence accumulation. Specifically, for each trial we used the raw EEG time-series (from the subject-specific sensor that was most predictive of the model-derived evidence accumulation

profile) to parametrically modulate the regressor amplitudes. We considered the entire trial duration (i.e. RT) minus the subject specific non-decision time nDT estimated by the model, which accounted for stimulus processing and motor execution. More specifically, we split this non-decision time in two intervals by fixing the motor preparation to 100 ms prior to the response (when a sudden increase in corticospinal excitability occurs⁸³) and setting the average duration of the stimulus encoding to $nDT - 100$ ms (Fig. 2a). To absorb the variance associated with other task-related processes we included three additional regressors: 1) an unmodulated stick function regressor at the onset of the stimuli, 2) a stick function regressor at the onset of stimuli that was parametrically modulated by the value difference (VD) between the decision alternatives and 3) a stick function regressor aligned at the time of response and modulated by RT (Fig. 2a). As a control analysis we also removed the RT and VD regressors from the GLM design to test if our EEG-informed regressor absorbed additional activations. The only activation we found in the EEG-informed regressor was the one capturing accumulation dynamics as in the main analysis (i.e. pMFC) with a marginal improvement in the statistical significance of the area. Regions previously absorbed by the other regressors moved to our constant term regressor (i.e. our unmodulated regressor). This finding suggests that it is truly the endogenous electrophysiological variability in our EEG-derived regressor that is driving the observed effects.

To test whether activity in the pMFC was driven instead by boundary adjustments we performed a separate analysis. We estimated individual trial boundaries directly from the EEG traces (i.e. EEG amplitude differences between the onset and offset of accumulation; Supplementary Figure 4e) and we included these estimates as a separate parametric predictor in our fMRI GLM analysis. We found that the activation in the pMFC remained attached to our original EEG regressor representing the full temporal dynamics of the decision process rather than being absorbed by the new boundary regressor. We formalized this observation by showing that our original regressor was a significantly better predictor of the fMRI signal in the pMFC than the boundary regressor ($t(20) = 4.21$, $p < 0.001$; paired t -test comparison of the β coefficients in pMFC; Supplementary Figure 4e).

Resampling procedure for fMRI thresholding In order to correct the fMRI statistical maps for multiple comparisons, we used a resampling procedure that took into account the a priori statistics of the trial-to-trial variability in all of our fully parametric regressors in a way that trades off cluster size and maximum voxel Z-score. Specifically, we maintained the overall distributions of the regressor amplitudes while removing the specific trial-to-trial correlations in individual experimental runs. Thus for each resampled iteration and each regressor type, all trials were drawn from the original regressor amplitudes, however, the specific values were mixed across trials and runs. We repeated this procedure 100 times and for each iteration we run a full 3-level analysis (session, subject and group). We then used the cluster outputs from the permuted parametric regressors to establish a joint threshold on cluster size and Z-score. Specifically, we considered the sizes of all clusters larger than 10 voxels and surviving a Z-score of $|2.57|$ (i.e. for positive and negative correlations with the permuted parametric regressors) to build a null distribution for the joint threshold described above. Finally, we used this distribution of cluster sizes and found that the largest 5% of cluster sizes exceeded 76 voxels. We therefore used these results to derive a corrected threshold for the statistical maps of our original data. All fMRI clusters described in our analysis survived this corrected threshold (that is, $Z > 2.57$, minimum cluster size of 76 voxels, corrected at $P < 0.05$).

Extracting time-series data We extracted time-series data from subject-specific pMFC clusters of interest for a psycho-physiological interaction (PPI) analysis (see below). We first drew subject-specific masks of the pMFC based on the overlap between the cluster obtained from the group analysis and the relevant (subject-specific) statistical maps in standard space (second-level analysis). For these statistical maps we used a more lenient threshold of $P < 0.05$ uncorrected, and cluster size > 10 voxels to accommodate for inter-subjects variability in statistical power and cluster's location. We subsequently back-projected these clusters from standard space into each individual's EPI (functional) space by applying the inverse transformations as estimated during registration (see fMRI

pre-processing section). Finally, we computed average time-series data from all voxels in the back-projected clusters in each subject to serve as a physiological regressor in the PPI analysis.

PPI analysis Using the procedure described above, we extracted time-series data from individual clusters in pMFC, which served as a seed region (that is, the physiological regressor—PHY) for a PPI analysis. This analysis was primarily designed to investigate the potential interaction of the area encoding accumulation of evidence with brain regions known to encode decision values. In other words, the increase in correlation between pMFC and these regions should be specific for the task in which this coupling is relevant; that is, it should be greater during the time window leading up to response time in which the accumulation of evidence unfolds and scale with the evidence for the decision. Therefore, we constructed our psychological (PSY) task regressor as a parametric regressor boxcar regressor with a step function in the interval between stimulus onset and - response time whose amplitude was modulated by the difference in value between the alternatives (zero otherwise). Correction for multiple comparisons was performed on the whole brain using the outcome of the resampling procedure as described earlier in the 'Resampling procedure for fMRI thresholding' subsection.

Author contributions

E.F., C.R. and M.G.P designed the experiments. E.F. and C.R. collected the data. M.A.P, E.F. and M.G.P. analyzed the data and wrote the paper. All authors discussed the results and implications and commented on the manuscript at all stages.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC; grant BB/J015393/2 to M.G.P.) and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC; grant ES/L012995/1 to M.G.P.). We thank Karen Mullinger for assistance with data collection and Philippe Schyns, Lawrence Barsalou, Joachim Gross and Robin Ince for useful comments on earlier versions of the manuscript. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Code availability

The code to generate the results and the figures of this study are available from the corresponding author upon request.

References

1. Gold, J. I. & Shadlen, M. N. The neural basis of decision making. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **30**, 535–74 (2007).
2. Usher, M. & McClelland, J. L. The time course of perceptual choice: the leaky, competing accumulator model. *Psychol. Rev.* **108**, 550–92 (2001).
3. Ratcliff, R. & McKoon, G. The Diffusion Decision Model: Theory and Data for Two-Choice Decision Tasks. *Neural Comput.* **20**, 873–922 (2008).
4. Heekeren, H. R., Marrett, S. & Ungerleider, L. G. The neural systems that mediate human perceptual decision making. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **9**, 467–479 (2008).
5. Philiastides, M. G., Heekeren, H. R. & Sajda, P. Human Scalp Potentials Reflect a Mixture of Decision-Related Signals during Perceptual Choices. *J. Neurosci.* **34**, 16877–16889 (2014).
6. O’Connell, R. G., Dockree, P. M. & Kelly, S. P. A supramodal accumulation-to-bound signal that determines perceptual decisions in humans. *Nat. Neurosci.* **15**, 1729–1735 (2012).
7. Wyart, V., de Gardelle, V., Scholl, J. & Summerfield, C. Rhythmic Fluctuations in Evidence Accumulation during Decision Making in the Human Brain. *Neuron* **76**, 847–858 (2012).
8. Mostert, P., Kok, P. & de Lange, F. P. Dissociating sensory from decision processes in human perceptual decision making. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 18253 (2015).
9. Kelly, S. P. & O’Connell, R. G. Internal and external influences on the rate of sensory evidence accumulation in the human brain. *J. Neurosci.* **33**, 19434–41 (2013).
10. Heekeren, H. R., Marrett, S., Bandettini, P. A. & Ungerleider, L. G. A general mechanism for perceptual decision-making in the human brain. *Nature* **431**, 859–862 (2004).
11. Filimon, F., Philiastides, M. G., Nelson, J. D., Kloosterman, N. A. & Heekeren, H. R. How Embodied Is Perceptual Decision Making? Evidence for Separate Processing of Perceptual and Motor Decisions. *J. Neurosci.* **33**, 2121–2136 (2013).
12. Tosoni, A., Galati, G., Romani, G. L. & Corbetta, M. Sensory-motor mechanisms in human parietal cortex underlie arbitrary visual decisions. *Nat. Neurosci.* **11**, 1446–1453 (2008).
13. Noppeney, U., Ostwald, D. & Werner, S. Perceptual Decisions Formed by Accumulation of

- Audiovisual Evidence in Prefrontal Cortex. *J. Neurosci.* **30**, 7434–7446 (2010).
14. Liu, T. & Pleskac, T. J. Neural correlates of evidence accumulation in a perceptual decision task. *J. Neurophysiol.* **106**, 2383–98 (2011).
 15. Ploran, E. J. *et al.* Evidence Accumulation and the Moment of Recognition: Dissociating Perceptual Recognition Processes Using fMRI. *J. Neurosci.* **27**, 11912–11924 (2007).
 16. Krajbich, I., Armel, C. & Rangel, A. Visual fixations and the computation and comparison of value in simple choice. *Nat. Neurosci.* **13**, 1292–1298 (2010).
 17. Milosavljevic, M., Malmaud, J. & Huth, A. The Drift Diffusion Model can account for the accuracy and reaction time of value-based choices under high and low time pressure. *October* **5**, 437–449 (2010).
 18. Krajbich, I. & Rangel, A. Multialternative drift-diffusion model predicts the relationship between visual fixations and choice in value-based decisions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 13852–13857 (2011).
 19. Rangel, A. & Hare, T. Neural computations associated with goal-directed choice. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **20**, 262–270 (2010).
 20. Rangel, A., Camerer, C. & Montague, P. R. A framework for studying the neurobiology of value-based decision making. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **9**, 545–56 (2008).
 21. Gerstner, W., Sprekeler, H. & Deco, G. Theory and simulation in neuroscience. *Science* **338**, 60–5 (2012).
 22. Polanía, R., Krajbich, I., Grueschow, M. & Ruff, C. C. Neural Oscillations and Synchronization Differentially Support Evidence Accumulation in Perceptual and Value-Based Decision Making. *Neuron* **82**, 709–720 (2014).
 23. Lopes da Silva, F. & van Rotterdam, A. in *Electroencephalography: Basic Principles, Clinical Applications, and Related Fields* (eds. Niedermeyer, E. & Silva, F. L. da) (Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Baltimore MD, 1982).
 24. Fouragnan, E., Retzler, C., Mullinger, K. & Philiastides, M. G. Two spatiotemporally distinct value systems shape reward-based learning in the human brain. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 8107

(2015).

25. Sajda, P., Philiastides, M. G. & Parra, L. C. Single-trial analysis of neuroimaging data: inferring neural networks underlying perceptual decision-making in the human brain. *IEEE Rev. Biomed. Eng.* **2**, 97–109 (2009).
26. Bogacz, R., Brown, E., Moehlis, J., Holmes, P. & Cohen, J. D. The physics of optimal decision making: a formal analysis of models of performance in two-alternative forced-choice tasks. *Psychol. Rev.* **113**, 700–765 (2006).
27. Basten, U., Biele, G., Heekeren, H. R. & Fiebach, C. J. How the brain integrates costs and benefits during decision making. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **107**, 21767–21772 (2010).
28. Hare, T. A., Schultz, W., Camerer, C. F., O'Doherty, J. P. & Rangel, A. Transformation of stimulus value signals into motor commands during simple choice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 18120–18125 (2011).
29. Mulder, M. J., van Maanen, L. & Forstmann, B. U. Perceptual decision neurosciences - a model-based review. *Neuroscience* **277**, 872–884 (2014).
30. Ratcliff, R. & Tuerlinckx, F. Estimating parameters of the diffusion model: Approaches to dealing with contaminant reaction times and parameter variability. *Psychon. Bull. Rev.* **9**, 438–481 (2002).
31. Ratcliff, R., Philiastides, M. G. & Sajda, P. Quality of evidence for perceptual decision making is indexed by trial-to-trial variability of the EEG. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 6539–6544 (2009).
32. Wyart, V. & Tallon-Baudry, C. How Ongoing Fluctuations in Human Visual Cortex Predict Perceptual Awareness: Baseline Shift versus Decision Bias. *J. Neurosci.* **29**, 8715–8725 (2009).
33. Clithero, J. A. & Rangel, A. Informatic parcellation of the network involved in the computation of subjective value. *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* **9**, 1289–302 (2014).
34. FitzGerald, T. H. B., Seymour, B. & Dolan, R. J. The role of human orbitofrontal cortex in value comparison for incommensurable objects. *J. Neurosci.* **29**, 8388–95 (2009).

35. Philiastides, M. G., Biele, G. & Heekeren, H. R. A mechanistic account of value computation in the human brain. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **107**, 9430–5 (2010).
36. Rushworth, M. F. S., Noonan, M. P., Boorman, E. D., Walton, M. E. & Behrens, T. E. Frontal Cortex and Reward-Guided Learning and Decision-Making. *Neuron* **70**, 1054–1069 (2011).
37. Tom, S. M., Fox, C. R., Trepel, C. & Poldrack, R. A. The neural basis of loss aversion in decision-making under risk. *Science* **315**, 515–8 (2007).
38. Kable, J. W. & Glimcher, P. W. The neural correlates of subjective value during intertemporal choice. *Nat. Neurosci.* **10**, 1625–1633 (2007).
39. Rushworth, M. F., Mars, R. B. & Summerfield, C. General mechanisms for making decisions? *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **19**, 75–83 (2009).
40. Neubert, F.-X., Mars, R. B., Sallet, J. & Rushworth, M. F. S. Connectivity reveals relationship of brain areas for reward-guided learning and decision making in human and monkey frontal cortex. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 1–10 (2015). doi:10.1073/pnas.1410767112
41. Rodriguez, C. A., Turner, B. M., Van Zandt, T. & McClure, S. M. The neural basis of value accumulation in intertemporal choice. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **42**, 2179–89 (2015).
42. Gluth, S., Rieskamp, J. & Büchel, C. Deciding when to decide: time-variant sequential sampling models explain the emergence of value-based decisions in the human brain. *J. Neurosci.* **32**, 10686–98 (2012).
43. De Martino, B., Fleming, S. M., Garrett, N. & Dolan, R. J. Confidence in value-based choice. *Nat. Neurosci.* **16**, 105–110 (2012).
44. Muraskin, J. *et al.* *Imaging decision-related neural cascades in the human brain.* *bioRxiv* (Cold Spring Harbor Labs Journals, 2016). doi:10.1101/050856
45. Fouragnan, E., Queirazza, F., Retzler, C., Mullinger, K. & Philiastides, M. Spatiotemporal characterization of the neural correlates of outcome valence and surprise during reward learning in humans. *bioRxiv* (2016). at <http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2016/12/05/091710.abstract>
46. Gluth, S., Hotaling, J. M. & Rieskamp, J. The attraction effect modulates reward prediction

- errors and intertemporal choices. *J. Neurosci.* (2016). doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2532-16.2016
47. Turner, B. M., van Maanen, L. & Forstmann, B. U. Informing cognitive abstractions through neuroimaging: the neural drift diffusion model. *Psychol. Rev.* **122**, 312–336 (2015).
 48. van Maanen, L. *et al.* Neural Correlates of Trial-to-Trial Fluctuations in Response Caution. *J. Neurosci.* **31**, 17488–17495 (2011).
 49. Twomey, D. M., Kelly, S. P. & O'Connell, R. G. Abstract and Effector-Selective Decision Signals Exhibit Qualitatively Distinct Dynamics before Delayed Perceptual Reports. *J. Neurosci.* **36**, 7346–52 (2016).
 50. Gherman, S. & Philiastides, M. G. Neural representations of confidence emerge from the process of decision formation during perceptual choices. *Neuroimage* **106**, 134–143 (2015).
 51. Twomey, D. M., Murphy, P. R., Kelly, S. P. & O'Connell, R. G. The classic P300 encodes a build - to - threshold decision variable. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* (2015). doi:10.1111/ejn.12936
 52. Linden, D. E. J. The p300: where in the brain is it produced and what does it tell us? *Neuroscientist* **11**, 563–76 (2005).
 53. Caviness, V. S., Meyer, J., Makris, N. & Kennedy, D. N. MRI-Based Topographic Parcellation of Human Neocortex: An Anatomically Specified Method with Estimate of Reliability. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* **8**, 566–87 (1996).
 54. Vogt, B. A. in *Neurobiology of Cingulate Cortex and Limbic Thalamus* 19–70 (Birkhäuser Boston, 1993). doi:10.1007/978-1-4899-6704-6_2
 55. Vogt, B. A. Midcingulate cortex: Structure, connections, homologies, functions and diseases. *J. Chem. Neuroanat.* **74**, 28–46 (2016).
 56. Vogt, B. A., Berger, G. R. & Derbyshire, S. W. G. Structural and functional dichotomy of human midcingulate cortex. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **18**, 3134–44 (2003).
 57. Penfield, W. & Welch, K. The supplementary motor area in the cerebral cortex of man. *Trans. Am. Neurol. Assoc.* 179–84 (1949).
 58. Kim, J.-H. *et al.* Defining functional SMA and pre-SMA subregions in human MFC using

- resting state fMRI: Functional connectivity-based parcellation method. *Neuroimage* **49**, 2375–2386 (2010).
59. Nachev, P., Kennard, C. & Husain, M. Functional role of the supplementary and pre-supplementary motor areas. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **9**, 856–869 (2008).
 60. Picard, N. & Strick, P. L. Imaging the premotor areas. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **11**, 663–672 (2001).
 61. Fink, G. R., Frackowiak, R. S., Pietrzyk, U. & Passingham, R. E. Multiple nonprimary motor areas in the human cortex. *J. Neurophysiol.* **77**, 2164–74 (1997).
 62. Coull, J. T., Vidal, F. & Burle, B. When to act, or not to act: that's the SMA's question. *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* **8**, 14–21 (2016).
 63. Nakamura, K., Sakai, K. & Hikosaka, O. Neuronal activity in medial frontal cortex during learning of sequential procedures. *J. Neurophysiol.* **80**, 2671–87 (1998).
 64. Krugel, L. K., Biele, G., Mohr, P. N. C., Li, S.-C. & Heekeren, H. R. Genetic variation in dopaminergic neuromodulation influences the ability to rapidly and flexibly adapt decisions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 17951–17956 (2009).
 65. Roy, M. *et al.* Representation of aversive prediction errors in the human periaqueductal gray. *Nat. Neurosci.* **17**, 1607–12 (2014).
 66. Fujioka, T., Trainor, L. J., Large, E. W. & Ross, B. Internalized Timing of Isochronous Sounds Is Represented in Neuromagnetic Beta Oscillations. *J. Neurosci.* **32**, 1791–1802 (2012).
 67. Klein-Flugge, M. C., Kennerley, S. W., Friston, K. & Bestmann, S. *Neural signatures of value comparison in human cingulate cortex during decisions requiring an effort-reward trade-off.* *bioRxiv* (Cold Spring Harbor Labs Journals, 2016). doi:10.1101/064105
 68. Pandya, D. N., Van Hoesen, G. W. & Mesulam, M.-M. Efferent connections of the cingulate gyrus in the rhesus monkey. *Exp. Brain Res.* **42-42**, 319–330 (1981).
 69. Pandya, D. N. & Kuypers, H. G. J. M. Cortico-cortical connections in the rhesus monkey. *Brain Res.* **13**, 13–36 (1969).
 70. Bohlhalter, S. *et al.* Neural correlates of tic generation in Tourette syndrome: An event-related

- functional MRI study. *Brain* **129**, 2029–2037 (2006).
71. Papoiu, A. D. P. *et al.* Brain's Reward Circuits Mediate Itch Relief. A Functional MRI Study of Active Scratching. *PLoS One* **8**, e82389 (2013).
 72. Veen, V. van, Krug, M. K. & Carter, C. S. The Neural and Computational Basis of Controlled Speed-Accuracy Tradeoff during Task Performance. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* (2008).
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2008.20146>
 73. Beckmann, M., Johansen-Berg, H. & Rushworth, M. F. S. Connectivity-Based Parcellation of Human Cingulate Cortex and Its Relation to Functional Specialization. *J. Neurosci.* **29**, 1175–1190 (2009).
 74. Forstmann, B. U. *et al.* Striatum and pre-SMA facilitate decision-making under time pressure. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **105**, 17538–17542 (2008).
 75. Wenzlaff, H., Bauer, M., Maess, B. & Heekeren, H. R. Neural Characterization of the Speed-Accuracy Tradeoff in a Perceptual Decision-Making Task. *J. Neurosci.* **31**, 1254–1266 (2011).
 76. Ivanoff, J., Branning, P. & Marois, R. fMRI Evidence for a Dual Process Account of the Speed-Accuracy Tradeoff in Decision-Making. *PLoS One* **3**, e2635 (2008).
 77. Donner, T. H., Siegel, M., Fries, P. & Engel, A. K. *Buildup of Choice-Predictive Activity in Human Motor Cortex during Perceptual Decision Making.* *Current Biology* **19**, (2009).
 78. Hanks, T. D., Ditterich, J. & Shadlen, M. N. Microstimulation of macaque area LIP affects decision-making in a motion discrimination task. *Nat. Neurosci.* **9**, 682–689 (2006).
 79. Shadlen, M. N. & Newsome, W. T. Neural basis of a perceptual decision in the parietal cortex (area LIP) of the rhesus monkey. *J. Neurophysiol.* **86**, 1916–36 (2001).
 80. Voss, A., Rothermund, K. & Voss, J. Interpreting the parameters of the diffusion model: an empirical validation. *Mem. Cognit.* **32**, 1206–1220 (2004).
 81. Miletic, S., Turner, B. M., Forstmann, B. U. & Van, L. Parameter Recovery for the Leaky Competing Accumulator Model. *J. Math. Psychol.* **76**, 25–50 (2016).
 82. Mullinger, K. J., Yan, W. X. & Bowtell, R. Reducing the gradient artefact in simultaneous

- EEG-fMRI by adjusting the subject's axial position. *Neuroimage* **54**, 1942–50 (2011).
83. Chen, R., Yaseen, Z., Cohen, L. G. & Hallett, M. Time course of corticospinal excitability in reaction time and self-paced movements. *Ann. Neurol.* **44**, 317–25 (1998).
84. Smith, S. M. *et al.* Advances in functional and structural MR image analysis and implementation as FSL. *Neuroimage* **23 Suppl 1**, S208–19 (2004).

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Task design, behavioral and modeling results and EEG. **(a)** Schematic representation of the experimental paradigm. After a variable delay (2-4 s), two stimuli (snack items) were presented on the screen for 1.25s and participants had to indicate their preferred item by pressing a button. The central fixation dimmed briefly when a response was registered. **(b)** Behavioral performance (black crosses) and modeling results (red circles). Participants' average ($N = 21$) reaction time (RT) and accuracy (top and bottom respectively) improved as the value difference (VD) between the alternatives increased. A sequential sampling model that assumes a noisy moment-by-moment accumulation of the VD signal fit the behavioral data well. **(c)** Average ($N = 21$) model-predicted evidence accumulation (EA) (black) and EEG activity (red) in the time window leading up to the response (on average, 600 to 100 ms prior to the response), arising from a centroparietal electrode cluster (darker circles in the inset) that exhibited significant correlation between the two signals (see Methods). Shaded error bars represent s.e. across subjects.

Figure 2. EEG-informed fMRI and connectivity analyses in the value-based task. **(a)** The fMRI GLM model included an EEG-informed regressor capturing the electrophysiological trial-by-trial dynamics of the process of evidence accumulation (EA) in each participant. Three actual single-trial EEG traces are shown. The traces cover the entire trial excluding the time intervals accounting for stimulus processing and motor execution (see inset and Methods for details). To absorb the variance associated with other task-related processes we included three additional regressors: VSTIM - an unmodulated stick function regressor at the onset of the stimuli, VD - a stick function regressor at the onset of stimuli that was parametrically modulated by the value difference between the decision alternatives and RT - a stick function regressor aligned at the time of response and modulated by RT. **(b)** Hypothetical EA traces in response-locked EEG activity ramping up with different accumulation rates. Convolving these traces with a hemodynamic response function (HRF) leads to higher predicted fMRI activity for longer compared to shorter integration times (i.e. the predicted fMRI response scales with the area under each EA trace). **(c)** The EEG-informed fMRI predictor of the process of EA revealed an activation in pMFC. **(d)** PPI analysis using the pMFC cluster identified in **(c)** as a seed revealed an inverse coupling with a region of the vmPFC and the STR. All activations represent mixed-effects and are rendered on the standard MNI brain at $Z > 2.57$, corrected using a resampling procedure (minimum cluster size, 76 voxels).