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Abstract

Although obesity is fundamentally a problem of energy balance wherein calorie intake exceeds calorie output, there is a multitude of psychological and neural factors inherent in eating and overeating. Behavioral and neuroimaging research suggests a relationship between emotion regulation and eating behavior. However, the connections among psychological characteristics, brain function, and weight loss maintenance are poorly understood. Accordingly, in the present study, fMRI was used to examine how two psychological characteristics, emotion amplification and rumination, are related to (a) neural response to food images both before (baseline [BL]) and after (3M) participants undergo a three-month behavioral weight loss intervention, and (b) initial weight loss and weight loss maintenance. Emotion amplification was associated with decreased activation in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) from BL to 3M. Rumination was associated with decreased activation in DLPFC from BL to 3M and increased activation in lateral prefrontal cortex, anterior cingulate cortex, parahippocampal gyrus, and amygdala from BL to 3M. Rumination was also inversely correlated with BL post-meal activation in DLPFC and caudate; activation in these two regions was prospectively associated with more weight loss from BL to 3M. Findings suggest that emotion amplification and rumination contribute to how food stimuli are processed at a neural level. Potential mechanisms for behavioral regulation and treatment implications are discussed.
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A Longitudinal Investigation of Psychological and Neural Mechanisms of Weight Loss

The Problem of Obesity

Obesity (body mass index [BMI] ≥ 30 kg/m$^2$) is a significant public health problem in the United States, with a current prevalence of roughly 35% of American adults (Flegal, Carroll, Kit, & Ogden, 2012). The health consequences of obesity include premature death, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, cancer, breathing problems, arthritis, reproductive complications, increased surgical risk, and emotional problems such as depression (Kopelman, 2000, 2007). A recent study estimated that obesity-related health care costs account for about 20% of total medical costs in the United States, at approximately $209.7 billion (Cawley & Meyerhoefer, 2011). Clearly obesity places a significant burden on the healthcare system, the economy, and the well-being of the general public.

Although fundamentally a problem of energy balance wherein calorie intake exceeds calorie output, obesity is a complex and heterogeneous medical condition (Brownell & Wadden, 1992). In an effort to better understand this complexity, various lines of research have examined the interactions among the neural, cognitive, and emotional correlates of eating behavior, obesity, and weight loss (e.g., DelParigi et al., 2006; Evers, Stok, & de Ridder, 2010; Macht, 2008; Niemeier, Phelan, Fava, & Wing, 2007; Polivy, Heatherton, & Herman, 1988; Polivy & Herman, 1999; Simmons, Martin, & Barsalou, 2005). From this literature, it is evident that difficulty with emotion regulation is influenced by brain function and negatively impacts the ability to manage eating behavior in the service of losing or maintaining body weight. Accordingly, the present study will examine characteristics of emotional processing such as self-reported ability to amplify emotion and tendency toward rumination, brain activation to food images, weight loss, and weight maintenance in a sample of obese adults entering a diet-based
weight loss program. It is anticipated that a better understanding of these relationships may contribute to individually tailored and more effective obesity treatments, particularly with respect to weight loss maintenance.

**Psychological Mechanisms of Eating and Overeating**

Eating behavior is driven by a multitude of biological, psychological, and social factors, many of which are beyond the scope of this paper. Importantly, however, eating is inherently an affective experience, a relationship that is reflected both in the psychological motivation to eat and overeat, and in the neural response to food cues as well as to food anticipation and consumption. The current understanding of the psychological theories and neural mechanisms of eating behavior may help to illuminate why losing weight and maintaining weight loss are so difficult for many people.

**Psychological theories of eating behavior.** Notably, psychological theories of eating behavior are predicated on the observation that the reward-related and emotion regulatory properties of food provide powerful motivation to consume and even over-consume highly palatable food, leading to disinhibited eating (e.g., Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996; Lowe & Levine, 2005; Muraven, Tice, & Baumeister, 1998; Stroebe, Mensink, Aarts, Schut, & Kruglanski, 2008; Stroebe, Papies, & Aarts, 2008; Vohs & Heatherton, 2000). Disinhibition is especially problematic among individuals attempting to control not only food consumption but also thoughts related to food and eating (Polivy & Herman, 1985; Stunkard & Messick, 1985). This cognitive and behavioral process, known as dietary restraint or restrained eating, was shown in early laboratory studies to be associated with increased ice cream consumption following a pre-load condition (Herman & Mack, 1975). Disinhibited eating may also occur in response to heightened self-referential negative affect, as a method of escaping this discomfort (Heatherton
Baumeister, 1991; Heatherton, Striepe, & Wittenberg, 1998), or even as a form of distraction from general distress (Macht, Haupt, & Ellgring, 2005). It has also been argued that the energy required for emotion regulation draws from a limited supply of self-regulatory resources, thereby reducing the ability to resist the temptation of tasty food and creating a vulnerability to disinhibited eating (Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996; Muraven et al., 1998; Vohs & Heatherton, 2000). Considered together, research findings indicate that heightened affect coupled with insufficient regulatory or coping ability set the stage for increased eating, particularly of energy dense foods, thereby impeding upon weight management goals.

**Brain function and eating behavior.** Among the factors contributing to effective management of eating behavior is the reliance on the balance of neural processes that initiate and terminate eating. Hunger is associated with activation of a network of brain regions that includes the amygdala, hypothalamus, insula, orbitofrontal cortex (OFC), hippocampus and parahippocampal gyrus, caudate, and putamen (LaBar et al., 2001; Tataranni et al., 1999). An analysis of multiple positron emission tomography (PET) studies revealed that the insula, OFC, and frontal and parietal operculum are prime regions for processing of gustatory stimuli (Small et al., 1999). Small et al. (1999) contended that the OFC is also involved in cognitive or motivational aspects of gustatory processing. Further, the specific food-related properties of fat and sweet differentially activated the ventral anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), suggesting this region’s involvement in motivating consumption of palatable foods (de Araujo & Rolls, 2004). Images of high calorie foods have been shown to elicit increased activation in regions of the brain known to be involved with habit learning and reward processing, such as dorsal and ventral striatum, including nucleus accumbens, and with taste information processing, such as OFC and insula (Rothemund et al., 2007). Additionally, food craving led to increased activation in the
striatum, insula, and hippocampus (Pelchat, Johnson, Chan, Valdez, & Ragland, 2004). In contrast, the termination of eating is associated with differential activation of dorsal and lateral prefrontal cortex, regions that are involved more generally in the inhibition and regulatory control of emotion and behavior. Studies have shown satiety to be positively associated with activation in the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC; Pannacciulli et al., 2006), bilateral DLPFC and ventrolateral PFC (VLPFC; Tataranni et al., 1999), and the left lateral PFC (Small, Zatorre, Dagher, Evans, & Jones-Gotman, 2001). Additionally, visual food cues have been shown to be associated with greater activation in areas of the brain typically involved in effortful emotion regulation and cognitive control, including DLPFC, VLPFC, and dorsal ACC (see Carnell, Gibson, Benson, Ochner, & Geliebter, 2012, for a review). With regard to food motivation and eating behavior, the DLPFC has been associated with heightened dietary restraint (Burger & Stice, 2011; Le et al., 2007), weight loss success (McCaffery et al., 2009), and cognitive control of food-related reward (Hollmann et al., 2011). However, research findings also indicate that greater activation in insula and operculum to food anticipation coupled with less activation in striatum to food consumption may lead to overeating due to blunted food-elicited reward response (Stice, Spoor, Ng, & Zald, 2009). The dorsal striatum has been associated with aspects of behavioral self-regulation including stimulus-response learning (Featherstone & McDonald, 2004), rule learning (Seger & Cincotta, 2006), and habit formation (Yin, Knowlton, & Balleine, 2004). There is also some evidence to suggest that dorsal striatum plays an inhibitory role, particularly when co-activated with DLPFC (Hollmann et al., 2011; Marsh et al., 2009).

Collectively, hunger and the motivation to eat are associated with activation of limbic, paralimbic, and striatal areas of the brain, as well as midline areas of the prefrontal cortex such
as OFC and ACC. Thus, the motivation to eat, particularly to eat palatable food, is driven by a network of regions found to be instrumental in processing taste, reward, and affective states. In contrast, satiety and decreased eating are associated primarily with activation of dorsal and lateral aspects of the prefrontal cortex. Therefore, cessation of eating is driven by activation in regions known to be responsible for emotion regulation, cognitive control, and behavioral self-regulation.

**Integration of psychological and neural mechanisms in eating behavior.** Because eating and emotions are intertwined, it is not surprising that the initiation and cessation of eating are modulated by many of the same brain regions known to facilitate the experience and regulation of emotions. Integration of psychological, behavioral, and neural findings may further clarify the mechanisms behind intentional weight loss and weight loss maintenance. Specifically, the current knowledge of emotions and eating may be applied toward better understanding why many individuals struggle with long-term self-regulation of eating and weight.

**Mechanisms of Weight Loss and Maintenance**

Despite the popularity of a variety of diets and the increased accessibility of health information, people experience great difficulty achieving and maintaining weight loss over time (Wiess, Galuska, Khan, Gillespie, & Serdula, 2007). The adage “eat less and exercise more” reflects the fact that weight loss can be achieved by decreasing energy intake and increasing energy output. Thus, most weight loss and weight loss maintenance interventions focus on changing diet, increasing physical activity, and engaging in self-monitoring behaviors such as frequent self-weighing. These components are generally supported by literature on successful weight loss and weight maintenance. However, it is also established that psychological
mechanisms including negative affect and disinhibition can hijack attempts to “eat less and exercise more.” Additionally, an emerging line of research has revealed that weight loss mechanisms appear at a neural level and that brain function may predict and/or reflect intervention success. Behavioral, psychological, and neural mechanisms of weight loss and maintenance will therefore be examined in more detail below.

**Behavioral mechanisms of weight loss and maintenance.** A large amount of empirical research has emerged from the National Weight Control Registry (NWCR), an ongoing registry composed of individuals who have lost at least 30 pounds (13.6 kg) and kept that weight off for at least one year (Klem, Wing, McGuire, Seagle, & Hill, 1997). Studies using the NWCR have shown that successful weight loss maintenance is associated with consumption of less than 25% of calories from fat, consumption of breakfast, eating five times per day (three meals and two snacks), engaging in greater than 60 minutes of physical activity per day, and consistent daily self-weighing (Bachman, Phelan, Wing, & Raynor, 2011; Butryn, Phelan, Hill, & Wing, 2007; McGuire, Wing, Klem, Lang, & Hill, 1999; Phelan, Roberts, Lang, & Wing, 2007; Schick et al., 1998; Wyatt et al., 2002). Other studies not using the NWCR that have examined behavioral predictors of weight maintenance have shown that successful weight maintenance is associated with weighing oneself weekly (VanWormer et al., 2009), frequently exercising at least 30-60 minutes per day (Befort et al., 2007; Kruger, Blanck, & Gillespie, 2006), eating five or more fruits and vegetables per day (Befort et al., 2007; Champagne et al., 2011), and practicing portion control (Befort et al., 2007; Kruger et al., 2006; Reyes et al., 2012).

**Psychological mechanisms of weight loss and maintenance.** Studies have found that the ability to engage in the aforementioned behavioral strategies in order to lose weight or maintain weight loss can be hindered by the presence of negative affect, especially when
emotion regulatory efforts are not successful. In a two-year prospective analysis of a large sample of individuals from the NWCR, Phelan et al. (2003) found that those who were unable to recover from relapse had higher scores on the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977) compared with those who were able to lose weight they had regained. Similarly, a qualitative investigation of 15 men and women in a behavioral weight loss program revealed that participants attributed difficulty with weight loss to emotion-related factors such as stress, depression, and fatigue (Adolfsson, Carlson, Undén, & Rössner, 2002). An additional qualitative study showed that poor adherence to self-monitoring through food diary use was associated with a tendency toward emotional eating, as well as with poor weight loss outcome (Burke, Swigart, Turk, Derro, & Ewing, 2009). Weight regain has been associated with a number of factors, including greater depression, dietary disinhibition, and binge eating (McGuire et al., 1999; Niemeier et al., 2007; Wing et al., 2008).

In contrast, the ability to cope effectively with temptation as well as the ability to generate and use emotion regulation strategies appears to positively influence eating behavior and weight management. A qualitative comparison of successful weight maintainers versus regainers indicated that positive self-talk and productive problem-solving were related to successful maintenance (Reyes et al., 2012). A cross-sectional study of obese women showed that relapsers (individuals who had lost weight but gained it back) tended to cope with problems by using avoidance methods such as eating, whereas maintainers tended to cope with problems by confronting and working to solve them (Kayman, Bruvold, & Stern, 1990). Drapkin, Wing, and Shiffman (1995) investigated coping responses to a set of hypothetical high-risk tasks in a sample of obese individuals with diabetes. They found that the number of hypothetical situations to which individuals who were able to generate any coping strategy was positively associated
with weight loss during a 12-month weight loss intervention. Similarly, Grilo, Shiffman, and Wing (1989) found that individuals who were able to generate either a cognitive or a behavioral coping strategy in response to an actual temptation situation were less likely to give in to the temptation and overeat. Elfhag and Rössner (2005) suggested that the successful weight loss maintainer establishes flexible control over eating and exhibits creativity in problem-solving and coping. Taken together, difficulty regulating negative affect may contribute to difficulty losing weight and maintaining weight loss, whereas ability to engage in adaptive emotion regulation strategies appears to facilitate weight loss outcomes.

**Neural mechanisms of weight loss and maintenance.** In the past two decades, various research groups have used brain imaging research using techniques such as positron emission tomography (PET) and functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) in order to examine the neural correlates of obesity (e.g., Dimitropoulos, Tkach, Ho, & Kennedy, 2012; Gautier et al., 2001; Le et al., 2006, 2007; Martin et al., 2009; Rothemund et al., 2007; Stice, Spoor, Bohon, Veldhuizen, & Small, 2008; Stoeckel et al., 2008). An in-depth discussion of these studies is beyond the scope of this paper (see Carnell, Gibson, Benson, Ochner, & Geliebter, 2012, for a review). However, in general, findings from imaging studies examining brain activity to images of appetizing food show that obesity is characterized by hyper-responsiveness in regions typically associated with reward, emotion, and taste processing (e.g., OFC, MPFC, rostral and subgenual anterior cingulate cortex, ventral striatum, insula, and hippocampus), as well as hypo-responsiveness in regions typically associated with inhibitory control and executive function (e.g., lateral PFC, dorsal ACC). It is noteworthy that obesity is effectively associated with hyper-responsiveness in regions of the brain that drive food motivation and hypo-responsiveness in those regions that modulate termination of eating.
Emerging research has also begun to characterize the neural correlates of weight loss and weight loss maintenance. At the present time, longitudinal neuroimaging studies comparing pre- and post-treatment activation are scarce. Two fMRI studies have investigated obese participants before and after bariatric surgery, and one fMRI study investigated obese participants before and after a non-surgical behavioral weight loss intervention. In order to investigate food cue-elicited activation, two studies presented stimuli both before and following a period of fasting, whereas the third study presented stimuli only following the fasting period. Across all three studies, one consistent finding was that post-intervention success was associated with decreased brain activity in regions typically involved in taste and reward processing. These studies will be described in greater detail below.

**Obese participants undergoing bariatric surgery.** To date, two studies have investigated individuals’ neural responses to food cues before and following bariatric surgery for weight loss. Ochner et al. (2011) scanned obese women before and after they received Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery. Participants were exposed to both visual and auditory stimuli of both high and low energy dense foods, one hour after consuming 250 Kcal of liquid nutrition. From pre- to post-surgery, participants showed decreased activation to high versus low energy dense food stimuli in right DLPFC, dorsal cingulate, lentiform nucleus, and ventral striatum. These changes were accompanied by decreased desire to consume the high energy dense foods. In the second study, Bruce et al. (2011) scanned obese men and women before and after they received adjustable gastric banding surgery. Participants were shown food and animal (nonfood) images before and after eating a standardized 500 Kcal meal. Brain response changes were observed when comparing pre- to post-surgery. At pre-meal, participants showed increased activation (post > pre-surgery) to food versus nonfood images in right middle and superior frontal gyrus.
(Brodmann Area 10). At post-meal, participants showed decreased activation (pre > post-surgery) to food versus nonfood images in middle and inferior frontal gyri and in insula/operculum. Further, lower post-surgery activation in inhibitory control regions at post-meal was associated with increased cognitive restraint, decreased hunger, and decreased disinhibited eating. Thus, in both studies, it appears that post-meal response to food pictures was characterized by a decrease from pre to post-surgery in both cognitive control regions (middle and inferior frontal gyri, DLPFC, dorsal ACC) and taste and reward processing regions (insula/operculum, lentiform nucleus, ventral striatum). Bruce et al. (2011) also demonstrated that pre-meal response to food pictures was characterized by an increase from pre to post-surgery in a cognitive control region often implicated in goal maintenance and pursuit (Ramnani & Owen, 2004). Additionally, in both studies, these findings were associated with decreased self-reported desire to eat. It should be noted that male and female participants in Bruce et al.’s (2011) study lost ~25% of initial body weight compared with only female participants in Ochner et al.’s (2011) study who lost ~12% of initial body weight. However, despite study design and weight loss differences, commonalities in neural mechanisms were observed.

**Obese participants undergoing behavioral intervention.** Although fMRI studies investigating brain changes associated with weight loss following bariatric surgery are rare at the present time, there are more studies investigating neural correlates of weight loss and/or weight loss maintenance achieved through only behavioral methods. The majority of these studies are cross-sectional in design, comparing formerly obese with healthy weight (never obese) individuals. Results indicate that successful weight loss is associated with increased activation in dorsal PFC and DLPFC in response to food stimuli, particularly after eating, as well as with heightened dietary restraint, which is positively correlated with activation in dorsal and DLPFC
(DelParigi et al., 2007; Le et al., 2007; McCaffery et al., 2009). Collectively, these findings indicate that engagement of dorsal and lateral PFC is critical for controlling eating behavior over both the short-term and the long-term.

To date, there is one longitudinal fMRI study examining neural mechanisms of weight loss. Murdaugh et al. (2012) compared a group of overweight and obese men and women enrolled in a behavioral weight loss program with a group of healthy weight control participants. All participants were scanned following an eight hour fast, at the beginning (pre-treatment) and end (post-treatment) of the 12 week weight loss period (controls were scanned 12 weeks after their baseline scanning session). Pre-treatment, the obese group showed greater activation to high calorie food images compared with images of cars in several emotion and reward processing areas, including insula, amygdala, and ACC. Twelve-week percent weight change among obese participants was positively correlated with pre-treatment high calorie food versus control image activation in multiple reward, emotion, and food processing regions, including the nucleus accumbens, insula, and frontal operculum, as well as cognitive control regions including ACC and middle frontal gyrus. In other words, greater baseline activation in these areas predicted weight gain during the twelve-week intervention period. Weight maintenance as measured nine months post-treatment was predicted by a greater decrease in activation in insula and putamen from pre- to post-treatment.

**Summary of longitudinal studies.** It is striking that both Ochner et al. (2011) and Bruce et al. (2011) reported finding that, from pre- to post-surgery, participants showed decreased activation after eating in both cognitive control and reward processing regions, and that these decreases were associated with behavioral indicators of lower food motivation. Additionally, pre-meal activation of Brodmann Area 10 to food versus nonfood images was negatively
correlated with pre-surgery BMI, suggesting that individuals who have higher BMI exhibit lower activation in this cognitive control region in response to visual food cues (Bruce et al., 2011). Similarly, Murdaugh et al. (2012) showed that successful weight loss and maintenance were associated with diminished activation in areas of the brain that process reward, emotion, and taste, suggesting that difficulty with weight loss and maintenance is associated with hyper-responsiveness to food cues in these same regions, both before and following behavioral treatment. One question that arises from these findings is whether a better understanding of some of the cognitive and emotional processes involved with eating might help to clarify the relationship between brain function and weight loss outcomes.

**Characteristics of Emotional Processing and Differential Effects on Eating Behavior**

Findings from the aforementioned longitudinal fMRI studies of weight loss, considered with psychological theories of eating behavior, suggest that the ability to efficiently regulate emotions might be associated with the ability to manage eating behavior, with the end result of successful weight loss and maintenance. Conversely, heightened affect coupled with insufficient regulatory or coping ability represents a liability toward achieving weight management goals. For example, individuals who report difficulty coping with negative life situations, perhaps due to having limited effective emotion regulation skills, are more likely to regain weight that they have successfully lost (Byrne, Cooper, & Fairburn, 2003). Control of eating behavior therefore relies on the efficient regulation of affective states, including specific emotions such as sadness and anger, general mood states such as dysphoria or anhedonia, and other valenced states such as reward anticipation. Thus, further examination of emotion regulation and its relation with eating behavior is warranted.

In order to understand why specific emotion regulation strategies have differential effects
on eating behavior, it is necessary to conceptualize emotion regulation as a process rather than a discrete event. The term *emotion regulation* encompasses a multitude of both automatic and purposeful processes that govern the selection, experience, and expression of emotions, including the ability to maintain or change the trajectory of emotions (Gross, 1998). Emotion regulation is therefore one specific type of self-regulation, which refers to a variety of “processes that enable an individual to guide his/her goal-directed activities over time and across changing circumstances (contexts),” and more specifically refers to “modulation of thought, affect, behavior or attention via deliberate or automated use of specific mechanisms” (Karoly, 1993, p. 25). Together, these processes are integral to the selection of long-term goals over short-term gratification, such as in the case of regulating eating behavior in the service of losing or maintaining body weight (Karoly, 1999).

Under some circumstances and for some individuals, processes and strategies of emotion regulation might negatively impact weight loss efforts. According to psychological theories of eating and overeating, heightened levels of negative affect and/or demands on self-regulatory resources leave an individual vulnerable to disinhibited eating (Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996; Heatherton & Baumeister, 1991; Heatherton, Striepe, & Wittenberg, 1998; Muraven et al., 1998; Vohs & Heatherton, 2000). When experiencing negative affect, many individuals engage in rumination, a cognitive process in which thoughts occur repetitively, automatically, and without leading to active problem-solving. In fact, rumination often results in amplification of negative (but not positive) emotions, and is thus indicative of self-regulatory failure. Similarly, although the ability to maintain or enhance positive affect is at first glance an adaptive form of emotional self-regulation (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2007), Yeomans and Coughlin (2009) found that high disinhibition was associated with greater snacking when in a state of induced positive
affect. In sum, both rumination and emotion amplification may contribute to overeating in the short-term and difficulty losing weight in the long-term.

**Rumination: A costly emotion regulation strategy.** When control of eating behavior is the goal, there are some emotion regulation strategies that are more psychologically costly than others. One costly strategy is rumination, during which an individual focuses attention on negative feelings in the absence of actually changing the situation (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991). According to the goal progress theory of rumination, an individual engages in rumination when there is a disconnect between the present and desired reality; from this stance, rumination is meant to be adaptive by keeping goal pursuit information readily accessible (Martin, Shrira, & Startup, 2004). However, if the goal is perceived to be unattainable, and if the individual lacks the cognitive flexibility to switch to a different goal, the result is depressive rumination that is counterproductive. As such, rumination could be considered either a poor strategy for emotion regulation or an indication that emotion regulation efforts have failed. In this sense, rumination tends to aggravate and prolong negative affect by contributing to avoidance and impairing problem-solving (Lyubomirsky, Tucker, Caldwell, & Berg, 1999; Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991). Thus, an unintentional effect of rumination might be perpetuation or even amplification of the very negative affect the individual is attempting to decrease.

Naturally, rumination and a ruminative response style have been associated with negative affect (e.g., depression, anxiety), cognitive inflexibility, and eating pathology (Aldao & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2010; Cropley, Michalianou, Pravettoni, & Millward, 2012; Davis & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2000; Kubiak, Vögele, Siering, Schiel, & Weber, 2008; Nolen-Hoeksema, Stice, Wade, & Bohon, 2007). Additionally, rumination appears to impact particular aspects of eating. For example, Cropley et al. (2012) found that individuals who tended to ruminate over work-
related issues after leaving work also tended to consume more unhealthy foods compared with individuals who did not ruminate about work. Rumination about food, especially when it is triggered by food advertisement, is associated with increased emotional eating (Kemp, Bui, & Grier, 2011). Given the prolific nature of advertisements for unhealthy foods, it is likely that individuals who tend to ruminate are particularly susceptible to consumption of these foods, which interferes with efforts to maintain a healthy weight.

**Emotion amplification.** Although a significant amount of literature is dedicated to understanding how individuals reduce negative emotion, relatively less has been devoted to examining how individuals increase emotions, including positive ones. Emotion amplification involves processes related to maintaining, intensifying, enhancing, and prolonging emotional experience (Gross, 1998; Hamilton, Karoly, Gallagher, McCurdy, & Karlson, 2009). Amplification may be either explicit or implicit; that is, it may occur voluntarily through effortful behavior or automatically without forethought. Furthermore, amplification may be proactive (e.g., gathering self-regulatory resources to increase positive affect and amp oneself up before an event) or reactive (e.g., using stimuli in the environment to maintain, intensify, enhance, or prolong an emotion experience already in progress).

Laboratory studies in which participants are instructed to up-regulate emotional intensity have yielded results suggesting that intensifying or upregulating emotion is an effortful process. In a test of the self-regulatory strength and depletion model, Muraven, Tice, and Baumeister (1998) found that upregulation and downregulation of emotional responses to a negative film both resulted in increased subjective fatigue as well as poorer performance on a handgrip physical exertion task, in comparison with a no-regulate control group. McRae, Ciesielski, and Gross (2012) instructed participants to use cognitive reappraisal strategies in the service of either
increasing positive affect or decreasing negative affect. They found that increasing positive affect was associated with both greater positive affect but lower decrease in physiological arousal compared with decreasing negative affect. Importantly, results from these two studies suggest that upregulation of emotions is an effortful process that may deplete an individual of energy necessary to engage in subsequent self-regulatory tasks. This might be further compounded if food is the source of energy for emotion amplification.

**The Emotion Amplification and Reduction Scales (TEARS).** Historically the affect regulation process has been difficult to measure. Thus, TEARS (Hamilton et al., 2009) were designed to capture the fundamental processes of emotional self-regulation and are intended to be valence nonspecific. The purpose of the scales is to measure the extent to which individuals feel they are able to change the trajectory of an emotional response by up-regulating and down-regulating emotion states, regardless of whether these states are positively or negatively valenced. The emotion amplification subscale is characterized by a person’s ability to intensify, harness, or prolong emotions or the effects of an emotion; this subscale covaried with positive affect and fatigue and inversely with negative affect and was uncorrelated with depressive symptoms (Hamilton et al., 2009). Emotion reduction is characterized by a person’s ability to soften, shorten, stop, or prevent emotions or their effects; this subscale covaried inversely with depressive symptoms, fatigue, and negative affect and was uncorrelated with positive affect (Hamilton et al., 2009). These data indicate that emotion amplification and reduction are related but discriminable processes that should be investigated as such.

**Summary**

Although many individuals use food to regulate affective states (Antin & Hunt, 2012; Macht & Simons, 2011; Thayer, Newman, & McClain, 1994), this behavior appears to be
particularly deleterious when obese individuals are attempting to losing weight and maintain weight loss (Lowe & Fisher, 1983; Ozier et al., 2008; Thayer et al., 1994). Studies show that negative and positive affect states might be associated with disinhibited eating when they are achieved through psychologically taxing processes such as effortful emotion amplification and/or rumination. Further, there is significant overlap between regions of the brain that process and regulate emotions and those that manage the initiation and termination of eating. Food is an affective stimulus to which the brain responds accordingly; however, brain networks may become hijacked in the service of effortful emotion regulation, leaving limited neural resource available for termination of eating. It is evident that the relations among ability to amplify emotion and tendency toward rumination, brain response to food cues, and weight loss maintenance are poorly understood. Therefore, understanding rumination and emotion amplification at a neural level may help to clarify the mechanisms behind their effect on weight loss outcome.

The Present Study

Significant attention in the literature as well as in popular media has been paid to how people regulate negative emotions, and in particular how people down-regulate negative affect. However, relatively little is known about how people up-regulate emotions, including positive ones. Given the limited understanding of emotion amplification, further investigation of this process, its neural correlates, and its association with weight loss outcomes is a novel area of exploration. Additionally, the effect of rumination on weight loss outcomes has not been explored but nevertheless represents a distinct target for intervention. Preliminary data (manuscript in progress) indicate that both emotion amplification and rumination are negatively correlated with percent weight loss during a diet-based weight loss intervention. Additionally,
preliminary analyses have revealed that emotion amplification is negatively correlated with activation in a prefrontal-striatal network in response to food versus nonfood images after consuming a small meal. Furthermore, percent signal change in these regions positively correlated with percent weight loss after three months, such that greater activation in this prefrontal-striatal network was associated with better weight loss outcome.

The intent of the present study was to build on these findings and address the links among brain function, psychological factors, and weight-related outcomes (see Figure 1). Specifically, fMRI data were acquired both before (BL) and after (3M) participants underwent a three-month behavioral weight loss intervention. Images of appetizing food were presented to participants both before and after eating a small meal, and rumination and emotion amplification were correlated with preprandial and postprandial brain activation. Clusters of activation were then analyzed in follow-up analyses to determine their relations with weight loss outcome at 3M and at the conclusion of the weight maintenance period of the intervention (9M).

**Research Aims and Hypotheses**

Although it is possible that rumination and emotion amplification are related processes, they were examined separately in the present study. Specifically, for each process, the neural correlates and weight loss outcomes were investigated. It was hypothesized that rumination and emotion amplification would show both common and distinct neural correlates at BL and at 3M. Consistent with the extant literature, food images were hypothesized to elicit response in a prefrontal-striatal-limbic network that included lateral PFC, ACC, MPFC, OFC, insula/operculum, striatum, and hippocampus/parahippocampal gyrus. It was predicted that, in the pre-diet (BL) analysis, no clusters in *a priori* regions would significantly correlate with TEARS Amplification scores. It was also predicted that emotion amplification would be
negatively correlated with activation in the DLPFC and dorsal striatum at the post-meal session. For the pre- to post-diet change (BL to 3M) analysis, it was hypothesized that high emotion amplification would be associated with less post-diet increase in inhibitory regions (lateral PFC, dorsal striatum, dorsal ACC) and with less post-diet decrease in taste and reward processing regions (OFC, MPFC, insula). In the pre-diet (BL) analysis, it was hypothesized that at both pre-meal and post-meal, rumination would be positively correlated with activation in regions responsible for cognitive activity, self-related processing, and emotional processing (lateral PFC, ACC, MPFC, insula, and hippocampal formation including parahippocampal gyrus). For the pre- to post-diet change (BL to 3M) analysis, it was hypothesized that that high rumination would be associated with less post-diet increase in cognitive control regions (lateral PFC, dorsal ACC) and with less post-diet decrease in self and emotion processing regions (OFC, MPFC, insula). Additionally, preliminary findings that both rumination and emotion amplification are inversely correlated with weight loss were expected to be confirmed.

**Method**

The present study was part of a longitudinal fMRI and diet intervention study investigating brain function predictors of weight loss and weight loss maintenance (NIH R01DK080090). In the longitudinal study, 80 obese participants were recruited to participate in a nine-month weight loss and maintenance behavioral intervention that involved moderate calorie restriction, titrated physical activity, and group psychoeducation. Healthy weight controls were also recruited to undergo fMRI and cognitive testing but not the weight management intervention. Scanning sessions took place both before and after the three-month weight loss portion of the intervention. Additional height and weight measurements were acquired six and nine months after the baseline appointment.
Participants

Complete datasets that included usable BL and 3M fMRI, BL TEARS Amplification and BL Rumination, and BL, 3M, and 9M weight data were collected from 50 young to middle-aged adults (age range 24–55 years) who were obese (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m²) but otherwise healthy at the start of the study. Participants were residents of northeast Kansas or northwest Missouri and were recruited through the Weight Control Research Project at the Energy Balance Laboratory on the University of Kansas-Lawrence campus. Exclusion criteria included recent weight loss or gain, high physical activity, smoking or other history of drug addiction, special dieting, medications that affect metabolism or appetite, inability to exercise, eating disorders, neurological and psychological disorders, metabolic disease, recent or current pregnancy or breastfeeding, and serious medical conditions such as diabetes, cancer, or cardiac event. All participants provided a signed physician's authorization form to participate in a weight loss program.

Questionnaires

The Emotion Amplification and Reduction Scales (TEARS). TEARS (Hamilton et al., 2009) are an 18-item self-report index of an individual's emotion regulation ability through amplification and/or reduction of emotions. TEARS were developed in order to assess emotion regulation as a process, namely individuals' self-reported ability to amplify or reduce an emotional response. This measure has demonstrated high internal consistency and criterion validity (Hamilton et al., 2009). Responses are on a 4-point rating scale, ranging from 1 (not at all true of me) to 4 (very true for me). For this investigation, only the 9 items from the TEARS Amplification subscale were used and the modified scale showed good internal consistency ($\alpha=.87$).
**Response Styles Questionnaire (RSQ).** The tendency to engage in rumination was measured by the RSQ (Nolen-Hoeksema, Morrow, & Fredrickson, 1993), a 32-item self-report assessment of people's cognitive and behavioral responses to sad or depressed mood. Participants are instructed to select from a list of thoughts and behaviors those that generally apply to them when they are in a sad or depressed mood. Thoughts and behaviors are classified as either ruminative responses or distracting responses. Although reliability over time varied depending on the length of the follow-up period (Kasch, Klein, & Lara, 2001; Nolen-Hoeksema, Morrow, & Fredrickson, 1993), the RSQ has nevertheless shown good construct validity through significant correlation with broad dimensions of negative affect (depression, trait anxiety, and neuroticism), as well as discriminant validity from specific (spider) phobia and aggression (Roelefs, Muris, Huibers, Peeters, & Arntz, 2006). For this investigation, only the 16 thoughts and behaviors classified as ruminative responses were used. In the current sample, the Rumination subscale of the RSQ showed acceptable internal reliability ($\alpha=.75$).

**Study Procedure**

All procedures were approved by the University of Kansas Medical Center Human Subjects Committee. Researchers reviewed the informed consent document with potential participants. All participants who agreed to participate were assigned a date and time for their MRI appointment. Participants also chose from among four lunch choices, all of which were standardized for energy [Kcal $\approx 500$] and macronutrient content (e.g., a weighed lean meat [turkey, ham, roast beef, or tuna] sandwich, slice of American cheese, vegetable [baby carrots or lettuce], fruit [strawberries, grapes, orange], and skim milk or Lactaid). Prior to their appointments, participants were instructed to eat breakfast “as usual” but to refrain from consuming anything except clear liquids within four hours of their MRI appointment. All
participants were run in the late morning to early afternoon (i.e., during lunch hours) in order to capitalize on normal daily hunger cycles and enhance ecological validity.

At the start of each MRI appointment, participants completed MRI safety screening. Researchers reviewed the study protocol with participants. Blood pressure, pulse, height and weight (in stocking or bare feet, all participants wearing scrubs), and waist circumference measurements were taken. Females also took a urine pregnancy test. The remainder of the study procedure was counterbalanced to minimize order effects. Approximately half the participants completed a pre-meal fMRI session, ate a small meal, completed the post-meal fMRI session, underwent cognitive testing and behavioral assessment, and filled out questionnaires. The remaining participants ate a small meal, complete the post-meal fMRI session, underwent testing and assessment and filled out questionnaires, and completed the pre-meal fMRI session four hours after finishing their meal. At the conclusion of MRI appointments, participants were thanked and dismissed. Participants were compensated for their contribution to the study.

fMRI Methods

**fMRI cognitive activation paradigm.** The experimental paradigm has been used in research studies with children (Bruce et al., 2010; Holsen et al., 2005) and adults (Bruce et al., 2011; Martin et al., 2009). Participants viewed food, animal (nonfood), and blurry images during two scanning sessions: (a) after fasting for four hours (pre-meal) and (b) immediately after eating a small meal (post-meal). Visual stimuli were images of food and animals obtained from professional stock photography. Animal (nonfood) images were used in order to control for general interest and visual richness. In an image validation pilot study, food and animal images were rated based on the extent to which they were appetizing, exciting (arousal), and pleasant (valence), using the methods of Lang, Bradley, and Cuthbert (1999). Selected food
images were significantly more appetizing than selected animal images ($p < .001$). No significant difference existed between the food and animal image groups with regard to valence ($p = 0.55$) or arousal ($p = 0.96$). These same food and animal images were blurred so as to be unrecognizable with a phase randomized Fast Fourier Transform in the MATLAB (The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, MA) program. Blurred images were used as baseline visual comparison stimuli to control for visual cortex activation during the paradigm.

The cognitive activation paradigm is represented in Figure 2. Each functional scan involved three repetitions of each block of each stimulus condition type (i.e., food, animal), which alternated between blocks of blurred images. Visual stimuli were generated with Presentation (Neurobehavioral Systems, Inc., Albany, CA) on a desktop computer running Windows 2000, and were then projected onto a screen behind the MRI scanner. Participants viewed the stimuli via a mirror that reflected the images on the screen. Stimulus presentation time was 2.5 seconds, with an interstimulus interval (ISI) of 0.5 seconds. Within each functional scan (6 minutes 36 seconds each), there was a total of 13 blocks of stimuli presentation; within each block, 10 images were presented, for a total of 130 data points per fMRI scan. Stimulus condition order was counterbalanced across subjects. Participants were instructed to remember as many food and animal images as they could while in the scanner. As an attention check, participants completed a recognition memory task outside the scanner, immediately following each scanning session.

**Image acquisition.** Scanning was performed at the University of Kansas Medical Center Hoglund Brain Imaging Center on a 3 Tesla head-only Siemens Allegra scanner (Siemens, Erlangen, Germany) fitted with a quadrature head coil. Participants’ heads were immobilized with head cushions. Following automated scout image acquisition and shimming procedures
performed to optimize field homogeneity, a structural scan was completed. T1-weighted anatomic images were acquired with a 3D magnetization prepared rapid acquisition gradient echo (MPRAGE) sequence (TR/TE = 23/3.06 ms, flip angle = 8°, field of view [FOV] = 192 × 100 mm, matrix = 192 × 192, slice thickness = 1 mm). This scan was used for slice localization for the functional scans, Talairach transformation, and co-registration with fMRI data.

Following the MPRAGE sequence, two gradient echo blood oxygen level dependent (BOLD) sequences were acquired in 43 contiguous oblique axial slices at a 40° angle (repetition time/echo time [TR/TE] = 3000/30 ms, flip angle = 90°, FOV = 220 mm, matrix = 64 × 64, slice thickness = 3 mm, 0.5 mm skip, in-plane resolution = 3 × 3 mm, 130 data points).

**Method to minimize susceptibility artifact.** To optimize signal in ventromedial prefrontal regions by minimizing susceptibility artifact from air sinuses and to standardize head positioning across individuals, BOLD sequences were acquired in oblique slices at a 40° angle. Additionally, all participants were positioned in the scanner so that the angle of the anterior commissure-posterior commissure (AC-PC) plane was between 17° and 22° in scanner coordinate space. The angle was verified with a localization scan.

**Data Analysis**

Functional MRI data were analyzed using the BrainVoyager QX statistical package and random effects (Brain Innovation, Maastricht, Netherlands, 2004). Preprocessing steps included trilinear 3D motion correction, sinc-interpolated slice scan time correction, 3D spatial smoothing with 4-mm Gaussian filter, and high pass filter temporal smoothing. Collectively, these steps were intended to improve signal-to-noise ratio and reduce motion-related artifact, with the end result of increasing the likelihood of detecting true BOLD activation. Functional runs with motion of more than 3 mm along any axis (x, y, or z) were discarded. Functional images were
co-registered to the anatomic images obtained within each session and normalized to the BrainVoyager template image, which conforms to the space defined by the Talairach and Tournoux’s (1988) stereotaxic atlas.

**Whole brain voxelwise statistical analyses.** Activation maps were analyzed using statistical parametric methods (Friston et al., 1995) contained within the BrainVoyager QX software. Statistical contrasts were conducted using multiple regression analysis with the random effects general linear model (GLM), allowing for multiple predictors (e.g., food versus nonfood, pre- versus post-diet) to be built into the model. Regressors representing the experimental conditions of interest were modeled with a hemodynamic response filter and entered into the multiple regression analysis using a random-effects model accounting for individual participant differences. Motion correction parameters were included in the GLM as regressors of no interest. In order to minimize voxels and therefore multiple comparisons, a brain mask was applied to the GLM analysis. The resulting GLM was overlaid with a contrast of food greater than nonfood, and separate beta maps were created and saved for each participant. This multi-subject beta map set containing beta values for the difference between activation to food and nonfood images (F−NF) was then entered into BrainVoyager’s ANCOVA function. TEARS Amplification and Rumination scores were entered separately as the covariates, with no between or within-subjects factors. Resulting correlation maps were overlaid on a three-dimensional rendering of a skull-stripped group average brain. To correct for multiple comparisons, a cluster-level threshold was applied (Forman et al., 1995). Based on BrainVoyager’s cluster level threshold estimator plugin, voxel values were considered significant if the activation survived a statistical threshold of $\alpha < .05$, corrected for whole brain. This procedure was performed separately for pre-meal and post-meal analyses, as well as for
Amplification and Rumination. Clusters of activation were identified and verified by mapping Talairach coordinates onto two atlases (Mai, Paxinos, & Voss, 2008; Talairach & Tournoux, 1988).

**Exploratory longitudinal analyses.** In order to determine whether emotion amplification or rumination is associated with changes in brain function over the course of a behavioral weight loss intervention, exploratory analyses were conducted. GLM files were created for pre-meal and post-meal and overlaid with the contrast (Food BL – Nonfood BL) – (Food 3M – Nonfood 3M), representing the interaction of timepoint (BL, 3M) and stimulus type (F, NF). Separate subject beta maps of these contrast values were then created, saved, and entered into BrainVoyager’s ANCOVA function. The rest of the analysis procedure matched those conducted for single timepoint analyses.

It was hypothesized that emotion amplification would be associated with less post-diet increase in inhibitory regions (lateral PFC, dorsal striatum, dorsal ACC) and with less post-diet decrease in taste and reward processing regions (OFC, MPFC, insula). Additionally, it was hypothesized that rumination would be associated with less post-diet increase in cognitive control regions (lateral PFC, dorsal ACC) and with less post-diet decrease in self and emotion processing regions (OFC, MPFC, insula).

**Follow-up region of interest (ROI) analyses.** Based on studies of emotion regulation, as well as those investigating food motivation (e.g., Bruce et al., 2010; Martin et al., 2009), several regions were considered a priori regions of interest, including lateral PFC, ACC, MPFC, OFC, insula/operculum, striatum, and hippocampus/parahippocampal gyrus. For a priori regions that showed a significant correlation between Amplification and F–NF beta value, or between Rumination and F–NF beta value, the mean percent signal change from all voxels within
activated clusters was extracted. For quality control purposes and to check for the presence of outliers, scatterplots were created depicting the extracted percent signal change values and Amplification/Rumination scores. Additionally, percent signal change values in a priori regions of interest were correlated with percent weight loss (BL to 3M and 3M to 9M separately) in follow-up analyses.

**Results**

Participant demographics and other characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Out of the 50 participants, 34 (68%) were female, 38 (76%) were Caucasian, and 47 (94%) had attended at least some college. Participants’ age range was 24 to 55 years ($M = 39.02$, $SD = 7.99$). BMI range was 30.45 to 43.58 kg/m$^2$ ($M = 35.16$, $SD = 3.37$). During the weight loss phase of the study (BL to 3M), participants lost 2.81 to 23.72% of baseline body weight ($M = 11.09$, $SD = 4.83$). During the weight maintenance phase of the study (3M to 9M), participants’ results ranged from gaining 11.04% to losing 16.80% of 3M body weight ($M = 1.04\%$ weight gain, $SD = 5.22\%$ weight gain). Neither TEARS Amplification nor Rumination scores were significantly correlated with either percent weight change variable, nor were they significantly correlated with each other (see Table 2). As shown in Table 3, women compared with men had higher scores on the WASI ($M = 115.21$ vs 108.94, $p=.034$), lost less weight from BL to 3M ($M = 9.56\%$ weight loss vs 14.36$\%$ weight loss, $p=.006$), and endorsed more tendency to ruminate ($M = 3.56$ vs 1.38, $p=.006$).

**Cross-Sectional Neuroimaging Results**

**Neural correlates of emotion amplification.** The clusters found to represent a significant correlation of TEARS Amplification score with the difference in activation to food versus nonfood images (F–NF beta value difference) are listed in Table 4.
**Pre-meal BL.** At pre-meal at baseline, Amplification score was not significantly correlated with the difference in activation to food versus nonfood images in any of the *a priori* regions. For *post hoc* regions, the difference between food and nonfood activation was inversely correlated with Amplification score in bilateral BA 39, specifically the right angular gyrus and the left middle temporal gyrus.

**Post-meal BL.** At post-meal at baseline, Amplification score was not significantly correlated with the difference in activation to food versus nonfood images in any of the *a priori* regions. For *post hoc* regions, the difference between food and nonfood activation was inversely correlated with Amplification score in right superior and middle frontal gyrus (both BA 6), as well as in right inferior parietal lobule.

**Pre-meal 3M.** At pre-meal at 3M follow-up, Amplification score was not significantly correlated with the difference in activation to food versus nonfood images in any of the *a priori* regions. For *post hoc* regions, Amplification score was inversely correlated with activation in left inferior occipital gyrus.

**Post-meal 3M.** At post-meal at 3M follow-up, Amplification score was not significantly correlated with the difference in activation to food versus nonfood images in any of the *a priori* regions. For *post hoc* regions, Amplification score was inversely correlated with activation in the right inferior occipital gyrus.

**Neural correlates of rumination.** Visual inspection of the scatterplots created from the correlation of percent signal change and Rumination score revealed that one participant had a score of 15, which was more than four standard deviations above the mean score. Therefore, clusters of activation that were clearly driven (and not simply enhanced) by the presence of the outlier were discarded. The remaining clusters found to represent a significant correlation of
Rumination score with the difference in activation to food versus nonfood images (F–NF beta value difference) are listed in Table 5.

**Pre-meal BL.** At pre-meal at baseline, Rumination score was positively correlated with activation in the *a priori* region of left middle frontal gyrus (BA 9; x, y, z = −48, 26, 31) and right superior frontal gyrus (BA 11; x, y, z = 18, 62, −15). For *post hoc* regions, positive correlations were found in left precentral gyrus, superior and inferior parietal lobule, and cerebellum, right superior frontal gyrus and cuneus, and bilateral cerebellum. Inverse correlations were observed in right inferior parietal lobule and fusiform gyrus.

**Post-meal BL.** At post-meal at baseline, Rumination score was inversely correlated with activation in *a priori* regions of left inferior frontal gyrus (BA 47; x, y, z = −39, 26, −8; BA 45; x, y, z = −48, 17, 4), left superior frontal gyrus (BA 10; x, y, z = −27, 50, 22), and right caudate nucleus (x, y, z = 9, −1, 16). For *post hoc* regions, inverse correlations were found in left superior and middle frontal gyrus, right precuneus, inferior parietal lobule, and middle/inferior temporal gyrus, left occipital gyrus, and right cerebellum and pons.

**Pre-meal 3M.** At pre-meal at 3M follow-up, Rumination score was significantly correlated with activation to food versus nonfood images in the *a priori* region of left middle frontal gyrus (BA 9; x, y, z = −27, 38, 28). For *post hoc* regions, inverse correlations were found in left precuneus and superior temporal gyrus, right middle temporal gyrus, right cerebellum, and left brainstem.

**Post-meal 3M.** At post-meal at 3M follow-up, Rumination score was positively correlated with activation in *a priori* regions of bilateral middle frontal gyrus (BA 9; x, y, z = −33, 20, 28; BA 10; x, y, z = 33, 47, 19 and −36, 44, 10), right inferior frontal gyrus (BA 45; x, y, z = 51, 23, 10; BA 44; x, y, z = 42, 8, 22), bilateral insula (x, y, z = 33, 14, −5; −39, 17, 4; −39,
right parahippocampal gyrus (BA 35; x, y, z = 24, −25, −17), and left hippocampus (x, y, z = −33, −19, −11). For post hoc regions, positive correlations were found in right superior frontal gyrus, precuneus, and middle temporal gyrus, as well as bilateral superior temporal gyrus and left cerebellum.

**Exploratory Longitudinal Analyses**

Exploratory analyses were conducted to correlate Amplification and Rumination scores with the contrast value of the interaction of timepoint (BL, 3M) and stimulus type (food, nonfood). In this analysis, a positive contrast value indicates BL>3M (decreased activation) for the food versus nonfood beta difference, whereas a negative contrast value indicates 3M>BL (increased activation) for the food versus nonfood beta difference. For example, a positive correlation with Amplification indicates that higher Amplification score was associated with decreased activation from pre- to post-diet, and an inverse correlation indicates that higher Amplification score was associated with increased activation from pre- to post-diet.

**Correlation with contrast values – Amplification.** The clusters found to represent a significant correlation between Amplification score and the contrast value from the interaction of timepoint (BL, 3M) and stimulus type (food, nonfood) are listed in Table 6. At pre-meal, a positive correlation was found in the a priori region of right superior frontal gyrus (BA 9; x, y, z = 21, 53, 51). At post-meal, post hoc regions showing significant inverse correlations were right superior frontal gyrus (BA 6) and right superior temporal gyrus.

**Amplification follow-up ROI analysis.** No a priori regions from either the primary (cross-sectional) or the exploratory (longitudinal) neuroimaging results were found to exhibit a significant correlation with percent weight change either from BL to 3M or from 3M to 9M.

**Correlation with contrast values – Rumination.** The clusters found to represent a
significant correlation between Rumination score and the contrast value from the interaction of timepoint (BL, 3M) and stimulus type (food, nonfood) are listed in Table 7.

At pre-meal, a positive correlation was found in the *a priori* regions of left middle frontal gyrus (BA 9; \(x, y, z = -48, 26, 34\)) and left anterior cingulate cortex (BA 24; \(x, y, z = -3, -10, 37\)). *Post hoc* regions showing positive correlations included an additional cluster in the left middle frontal gyrus, as well as left precentral gyrus, precuneus, and parietal cortex.

At post-meal, significant inverse correlations were found bilaterally in *a priori* regions of superior frontal gyrus (BA 10; \(x, y, z = -24, 50, 25\); BA 9; \(x, y, z = 21, 50, 28\)), inferior frontal gyrus (BA 9; \(x, y, z = -51, 11, 28\); BA 45; \(x, y, z = 54, 26, 4\)), and parahippocampal gyrus (BA 36; \(x, y, z = -24, -31, -17\) and \(24, -28, -17\)), as well as in right anterior cingulate cortex (BA 32; \(x, y, z = 12, 35, 10\)) and left amygdala (\(x, y, z = -21, -7, -8\)). *Post hoc* regions showing inverse correlations were bilateral medial frontal gyrus, left precentral gyrus, posterior cingulate gyrus, precuneus, superior parietal lobule, and middle temporal gyrus, and right postcentral gyrus, superior temporal gyrus, and lingual gyrus, as well as bilateral cerebellum.

**Rumination follow-up ROI analysis – weight change BL to 3M.** Percent weight change BL to 3M was found to be inversely correlated with activation in the left superior frontal gyrus (\(x, y, z = -27, 50, 22\); \(r = -0.301; p = .033\)) and the right caudate (\(x, y, z = 9, -1, 16\); \(r = -0.281; p = .048\)) at the BL post-meal session, such that greater activation (F>NF) in these regions was prospectively correlated with more weight loss (see Figure 2 and 3).

**Rumination follow-up ROI analysis – weight change 3M to 9M.** No *a priori* regions from either the pre-meal or the post-meal interaction correlation showed a significant correlation with weight change from 3M to 9M.
Discussion

This study investigated how the psychological variables emotion amplification and rumination are related to brain activation to food images in an obese diet-seeking sample, and how these factors are related to an individual’s ability to lose weight and maintain weight loss. Contrary to hypotheses, neither Amplification nor Rumination score was significantly correlated with either short-term (BL to 3M) or long-term (3M to 9M) weight change, suggesting that neither variable itself is a significant determinant of weight management.

Neural Correlates of Emotion Amplification in the Context of Food Motivation and Weight Loss

Pre-diet (BL). It was anticipated that no clusters in a priori regions would survive the pre-meal BL analysis of correlations with TEARS Amplification after the cluster-size threshold was applied. This was supported in that, at pre-meal, only bilateral BA 39 (right angular gyrus and left middle temporal gyrus) showed significant, albeit negative, correlations with TEARS Amplification score. BA 39 encompasses the angular gyrus, which plays a role in action awareness (Farrer et al., 2008), as well as caudal aspects of the temporal cortex, which are involved in semantic memory, specifically for information about objects (Binder, Desai, Graves, & Conant, 2009). Additionally, Binder et al. (2009) suggested that the angular gyrus contributes to semantic processing by integrating complex information for the purposes of problem-solving and planning.

It was also anticipated that emotion amplification would be negatively correlated with activation in the DLPFC and dorsal striatum at the post-meal session, a hypothesis that was not supported. Because these hypotheses were driven by results from preliminary analyses with a larger sample (n = 75), the present null findings can likely be attributed to the significantly
smaller sample size. Among *post hoc* findings, inverse correlations were found in right superior frontal gyrus corresponding to the presupplementary motor area (pre-SMA), right middle frontal gyrus corresponding to the dorsal premotor cortex, and right inferior parietal lobule. The pre-SMA is implicated in attention to intended self-initiated movement (as opposed to stimulus-driven reactions) and in response selection, including both inhibition of inappropriate behavior as well as selection of appropriate responses (Hoffstaedter, Grefkes, Zilles, & Eickoff, 2013; Lau, Rogers, Haggard, & Passingham, 2004; Mostofsky & Simmonds, 2008). The dorsal premotor cortex appears to modulate execution of chosen movement (Hoffstaedter et al., 2013), which may explain why this region has shown increased activation in response to high food motivation conditions, such as external food sensitivity (Passamonti et al., 2009) and highly hedonic food images (Cornier, Von Kaenel, Bessesen, & Tregellas, 2007). The right inferior parietal lobule is part of a fronto-parietal network that modulates sustained attention and salience detection, thereby facilitating behavioral flexibility (Hopfinger, Buonocore, & Mangun, 2000; Singh-Curry & Husain, 2009).

Collectively, the present findings indicate that differences in emotion amplification ability are associated with differential brain response to food images in a sample of diet-seeking obese adults. Specifically, individuals who self-report as low compared with high amplifiers appear to respond to appetitive cues with greater activation in areas of the brain that have been implicated in self-awareness, intentional movement, and action preparation. These differences may influence how semantic or contextual information is processed in the service of behavioral self-regulation.

**Post-diet (3M).** At post-diet, TEARS Amplification score was found to be inversely correlated with pre-meal activation (F–NF) in left inferior occipital gyrus and with post-meal
activation (F–NF) in right inferior occipital gyrus. These results are consistent with a meta-analysis of studies of visual food cue processing, which revealed that the lateral occipital complex is commonly activated in comparisons of food versus nonfood images (van der Laan, de Ridder, Viergever, & Smeets, 2011). The authors suggested that, because food and nonfood images were generally matched within studies for valence and arousal levels, the likely explanation for greater visual cortex activation to food images is the emotional and salient nature of food pictures. Thus, differences in emotion amplification appear to be associated with differential responding in regions of the brain commonly recruited for visual processing.

However, because Amplification score and weight change were not significantly correlated in the present analysis, it is unclear whether this differential responding negatively impacts efforts to manage eating behavior and weight.

**Pre- to post-diet change (BL–3M).** It was hypothesized that high emotion amplification would be associated with less post-diet increase in inhibitory regions (lateral PFC, dorsal striatum, dorsal ACC) and with less post-diet decrease in taste and reward processing regions (OFC, MPFC, insula). These hypotheses were partially supported. In the exploratory longitudinal analysis, Amplification score showed a positive correlation with the pre-meal contrast value in right superior frontal gyrus corresponding to the DLPFC, and with the post-meal contrast value in the right superior frontal gyrus corresponding to pre-SMA as well as right superior temporal gyrus. It is important to note that, for the pre-SMA, the maximally activated voxel for this contrast is very close to that for the cross-sectional baseline post-meal (F–NF) contrast. Therefore, according to the correlation, higher Amplification score was associated with a decrease in activation (food versus nonfood images) in the pre-SMA from BL to 3M. Follow-up inspection of the activation pattern of the DLPFC revealed that whereas the F–NF contrast
was not correlated with Amplification score at baseline (pre-diet), the same contrast was
inversely correlated with Amplification score at 3M (post-diet), such that higher Amplification
was associated with less activation to food versus nonfood images at 3M. In other words, high
Amplification was associated with a greater decrease in food cue-elicited response in the DLPFC
from BL to 3M.

The DLPFC plays an important role in self-regulation. For example, a recent
neuroimaging study found the left DLPFC to be associated with resolution of conflict in the
service of choosing the situationally appropriate course of action (Wittfoth, Schardt, Fahle, &
Herrmann, 2009). Furthermore, the DLPFC shows activation during tasks of effortful emotion
regulation (e.g., Goldin, McRae, Ramel, & Gross, 2008; McRae et al., 2010; Ochsner, Bunge,
Gross, & Gabrieli, 2002; Ochsner et al., 2004; Phan et al., 2005). With regard to food motivation
and eating behavior, the DLPFC has been associated with heightened dietary restraint (Burger &
Stice, 2011; Le et al., 2007), weight loss success (McCaffery et al., 2009), and cognitive control
of food-related reward (Hollmann et al., 2011). Additionally, Kringelbach, de Araujo, and Rolls
(2004) suggested that the left DLPFC might be involved in taste processing, particularly in
relation to the generation of cognitive and behavioral processes related to the initiation and
cessation of eating. Considered together, the extant literature and the present findings suggest
that high ability and tendency to amplify emotions may be associated with hypo-activation in
brain regions known to be involved in self-regulation.

In summary, individual differences in emotion amplification were associated with
differential brain response to food images in areas of the brain typically involved with
modulation of attention, self-awareness, and action preparation. In these regions, higher levels
of amplification were correlated with relatively less activation to food than nonfood images post-
meal prior to starting the diet. Additionally, higher levels of amplification were associated with decreased pre-meal DLPFC activation from before to after the diet.

Neural Correlates of Rumination in the Context of Food Motivation and Weight Loss

It was hypothesized that at both pre-meal and post-meal, rumination would be positively correlated with activation in regions responsible for cognitive activity, self-related processing, and emotional processing (lateral PFC, ACC, MPFC, insula, and hippocampal formation including parahippocampal gyrus). These hypotheses were somewhat supported, in that significant albeit inverse correlations were found in lateral PFC at both pre-diet and post-diet timepoints. Consistent with hypotheses, activation in insula and hippocampal formation showed positive correlations with Rumination score at post-diet. Change in activation from pre-diet to post-diet was correlated with activation in lateral PFC, ACC, MPFC, and hippocampal formation. Unanticipated findings included correlations with caudate nucleus and amygdala. Findings will be discussed sequentially.

Pre-diet (BL). At pre-meal pre-diet, Rumination score was positively correlated with activation (F>NF) in left middle frontal gyrus corresponding to the DLPFC, as well as in the right superior frontal gyrus corresponding to the anterior orbitofrontal cortex (OFC). Similar regions were found to be activated more in depressed than non-depressed control participants during a rumination (compared with distraction) task (Cooney, Joormann, Eugène, Dennis, & Gotlib, 2010). Furthermore, Spielberg et al. (2012) found left DLPFC and right anterior OFC to be functionally connected as part of a network responsible for maintenance of goal pursuit. The anterior OFC has shown increased activation in response to both anticipation and receipt of taste reward (O’Doherty, Deichmann, Critchley, & Dolan, 2002). These findings suggest that, before eating, individuals who report higher levels of rumination display hyper-responsiveness in brain
regions that modulate behavioral and emotional self-regulation and contribute to evaluation of reward stimuli.

At post-meal pre-diet, Rumination score was inversely correlated with activation (F>NF) in left ventrolateral PFC (VLPFC) and DLPFC. VLPFC has shown increased activation during emotion regulation tasks, including emotion suppression and cognitive reappraisal (Goldin et al., 2008; Ochsner et al., 2004; Phan et al., 2005). As depicted in Figure 2, signal change in the DLPFC and BA 10 also showed an inverse correlation with percent weight change BL to 3M, such that greater post-meal activation to food versus nonfood at pre-diet (a) was associated with lower rumination score and (b) predicted more weight loss during the diet intervention. The more lateral portions of BA 10, such as those found in these analyses, have been associated with maintenance of internally generated thought (Burgess, Scott, & Frith, 2003), as well as with planning-related processes (Wagner, Koch, Reichenbach, Sauer, & Schlösser, 2006) and complex problem-solving (Strange, Henson, Friston, & Dolan, 2001). These findings suggest that higher levels of rumination are associated with less activation to food than nonfood images in cognitive control regions after eating, which is in turn prospectively associated with poorer weight loss outcome.

Unexpectedly, the caudate nucleus showed an inverse correlation between Rumination score and activation to food versus nonfood images, as well as an inverse correlation with weight change during the diet (see Figure 3). Specifically, lower Rumination score was correlated with greater activation in the caudate; greater activation in the caudate (i.e., F>NF) was prospectively associated with more weight loss, whereas less activation in the caudate (i.e., F<NF) was prospectively associated with less weight loss. The caudate is part of the striatum, and the cluster of activation found in the present analysis falls in the dorsal extent, which has been
associated with various aspects of behavioral self-regulation (Featherstone & McDonald, 2004; Seger & Cincotta, 2006; Yin, Knowlton, & Balleine, 2004). Additionally, the dorsal striatum appears to play a role in decision-making by maintaining information about contingencies (O’Doherty et al., 2004). Studies of food motivation and obesity have implicated the caudate in evaluation and anticipation of potential reward, with findings generally showing that obese relative to healthy weight exhibited greater food picture-elicited activation in the caudate, particularly after eating and when the pictures are of high calorie foods (Dimitropoulos et al., 2012; Nummenmaa et al., 2012; Rothemund et al., 2007). Additionally, Pelchat et al. (2004) found greater caudate activity to be associated with greater food craving. Taken together, the caudate appears to play a role in the modulation of goal-directed behavior. Findings from the present study suggest that differences in the tendency to ruminate are also associated with differential brain function in regions that contribute to flexible behavioral self-regulation.

**Post-diet (3M).** At pre-meal post-diet, Rumination score was inversely correlated with activation (F>NF) in the left DLPFC. This contrasts with the finding that at pre-meal prior to beginning the diet, Rumination score showed a positive correlation with activation in this same region. Thus, whereas greater tendency to ruminate was associated with hyper-responsiveness in regions responsible for cognitive and behavioral self-regulation pre-diet, it was associated with hypo-responsiveness in the same regions post-diet.

At post-meal post-diet, several original hypotheses were supported. Rumination score was positively correlated with activation to food versus nonfood images in bilateral middle frontal gyrus corresponding to the DLPFC, right inferior frontal gyrus corresponding to lateral PFC, bilateral insula, right parahippocampal gyrus, and left hippocampus. Thus, in each of these regions, higher Rumination score was associated with more activation to food versus nonfood
images. These findings are consistent with the extant literature indicating that rumination is associated, in general, with differential brain activity during fMRI cognitive paradigms (Ray et al., 2005), and specifically with greater activation in regions involved in both cognitive and emotional/interoceptive processes (Cooney et al., 2010; Thomas et al., 2011). Additionally, Pelchat et al. (2004) found that the hippocampus, insula, and caudate were all associated with food craving, a process that might be cognitively similar to rumination (i.e., difficulty disengaging from thoughts of the craved food or a particular line of thinking).

The three insula clusters (two on the left and one on the right) showed a positive correlation between activation (F>NF) and Rumination score at post-meal post-diet. The insular cortex is a commonly activated region in fMRI studies due to its involvement in processes across a variety of domains, to include olfactory/gustatory, social/emotional, sensorimotor, and cognitive (Cauda et al., 2012; Kurth, Zilles, Fox, Laird, & Eickhoff, 2010; Simmons et al., 2012). Therefore, it is not surprising that the insula represented a significant correlation between a cognitive-emotional response style and food-cue elicited brain activity. Several studies have found that obese compared with healthy weight individuals exhibit greater food cue-elicited activation in the insula (e.g., Rothemund et al., 2007; Scharmüller, Übel, Ebner, & Schienle, 2012; Stoeckel et al., 2008), and activation in the insula has been correlated with appetite (Porubská, Veit, Preissl, Fritsche, & Birbaumer, 2006). Thus, individuals with a ruminative response style may experience difficulty shutting down the emotional and appetitive response to food images, even after eating. Although the insula may be structurally and functionally parcelled into subregions “specialized” for particular domains, it is striking that the three clusters of activation in the present analysis represent multiple subregions.

At post-meal post-diet, an additional set of a priori regions, the hippocampus and
parahippocampal gyrus, showed a positive correlation between Rumination score and activation to food versus nonfood images. Both the hippocampus and the parahippocampal gyrus are part of a medial temporal lobe network that modulates various aspects of memory, including declarative memory (Eichenbaum, 2004), autobiographical memory (Fink et al., 1996) and the association of learned information (Henke, Weber, Kneifel, Wieser, & Buck, 1999). Additionally, these regions tend to show differential patterns of activation to changing conditions of food motivation. For example, Martin et al. (2009) found that obese versus healthy weight participants showed greater activation to food images in the parahippocampal gyrus at pre-meal and the hippocampus at post-meal. Gautier et al. (2001) found that satiety was associated with decreased activation in the parahippocampal gyrus. Additionally, Bohon, Stice, and Spoor (2009) found that female emotional eaters showed greater activation in the parahippocampal gyrus during anticipation of food in a negative mood. Taken together, studies indicate that the hippocampus and parahippocampal gyrus are activated under conditions of high food motivation, and that negative affect may exaggerate this effect. Thus, the positive correlation between activation in these regions and rumination score might reflect among high ruminators difficulty shutting down the desire to eat, even (a) after eating and (b) following a weight loss intervention.

**Pre- to post-diet change (BL–3M).** It was hypothesized that high rumination would be associated with less post-diet increase in cognitive control regions (lateral PFC, dorsal ACC) and with less post-diet decrease in self and emotion processing regions (OFC, MPFC, insula). These hypotheses were partially supported. In the exploratory longitudinal analyses, Rumination score was positively correlated with the pre-meal contrast value in left middle frontal gyrus corresponding to the DLPFC. In other words, from pre- to post-diet, high rumination was associated with decreased activation to food versus nonfood images in the pre-meal condition.
At post-meal, Rumination score was inversely correlated with the interaction contrast value in bilateral superior frontal gyrus corresponding to DLPFC, bilateral inferior frontal gyrus, corresponding to VLPFC, right anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), bilateral parahippocampal gyrus, and left amygdala. Thus, higher rumination score was correlated with increased activation (food versus nonfood) in these regions from pre to post-diet. One role for the ACC is to modulate decision-making by focusing attention on reward contingencies (Bush et al., 2002). The cluster of activation in the ACC has shown greater activation among obese relative to healthy weight participants viewing high caloric food images (Brooks, Cedernaes, & Schiöth, 2013; Stoeckel et al., 2008). The amygdala plays an integral role in both positive and negative emotion processing (Hamann, Ely, Hoffmann, & Kilts, 2002), as well as in encoding information into memory (Hamann, Ely, Grafton, & Kilts, 1999; McGaugh, 2004). Activation of the amygdala during memory encoding may result in otherwise neutral stimuli becoming valenced, particularly in the case of individuals who are vulnerable to depression (van Eijndhoven et al., 2011). Additionally, the amygdala is active during processing of food stimuli (Siep et al., 2009; van der Laan et al., 2011), particularly when food is felt to be highly rewarding (Beaver et al., 2006; Goldstone et al., 2009). It could be that among individuals who tend to ruminate, attempts to diet or to control eating behavior result in food becoming even more salient and more difficult to resist.

In summary, individual differences in rumination were associated primarily with differential brain response to food images in areas of the brain typically involved with cognitive control, interoception, self-related processing, and emotion processing. The present findings also suggest that individuals who tend to ruminate show greater food cue-elicited response in both the primary gustatory cortex as well as in regions of the brain implicated in emotional and cognitive
regulation. Additionally, at post-meal pre-diet, activation in brain regions involved with behavioral self-regulation was inversely correlated with Rumination score and prospectively associated with more weight loss during the initial three month weight loss period. Thus, tendency to ruminate may interfere weight management efforts if it is also associated with limited flexibility in self-regulation.

**General Discussion**

Eating is inherently an emotional experience, and it is difficult to disentangle homeostatic and hedonic aspects of food motivation. Although the current society could be considered obesogenic, not everyone meets criteria for obesity, and not everyone has difficulty managing eating behavior in the service of maintaining appropriate body weight. Additionally, many people engage in unhealthy eating behaviors, including using food to regulate emotions. Thus, individual variability must play a role: psychological or personality-related factors inevitably influence a person’s relationship with food. Results from the present investigation suggest that emotion amplification and rumination are not in and of themselves a liability in weight loss efforts. However, these factors are associated with brain response patterns to food images that increase vulnerability to maladaptive eating patterns, which could result in difficulty managing weight. In particular, engagement of brain areas implicated in behavioral self-regulation (i.e., DLPFC and caudate) may be a determining factor for whether rumination is detrimental to weight management efforts.

One outstanding question is under what circumstances emotion amplification and/or rumination might contribute to overeating or unhealthy eating behavior. Because there is limited research addressing this association, it would be fruitful to examine and discuss potential aspects of each psychological characteristic that could influence how a person responds to food cues. In
the following sections, neuroimaging findings from the present study will be integrated with the extant behavioral literature on emotions and eating.

**Emotion amplification.** In the present study, TEARS Amplification score was associated with decreased activation from pre- to post-diet in the DLPFC, suggesting that some aspects of emotion amplification negatively impact brain networks supporting self-regulation. One possibility is that the end emotion state, either increased positive or negative affect, is itself associated with increased eating. There is considerable research evidence to support this hypothesis. For example, experimentally induced positive mood has been associated with increased consumption of high calorie foods among emotional eaters (Bongers, Jansen, Havermans, Roefs, & Nederkoorn, 2013; Bongers, Jansen, Houben, & Roefs, 2013), disinhibited eaters (Bongers, Jansen, Houben, & Roefs, 2013; Turner, Luszczynska, Warner, & Schwarzer, 2010), healthy weight individuals (Evers et al., 2013), and obese individuals (Udo et al., 2012). Likewise, negative affect was associated with increased food consumption following a negative mood induction and food exposure condition (Jansen et al., 2008; Loxton, Dawe, & Cahill, 2011). Thus, it is possible that among high amplifiers, emotional arousal itself, regardless of valence, may contribute to eating and potentially overeating (Evers et al., 2013). Although mood was not manipulated in the present study, it is possible that decreased activation of inhibitory brain regions upon exposure to food cues is a neural mechanism of the relationship between affective state and food consumption.

A second aspect of emotion amplification that may interfere with effective self-regulation is the process of amplification itself, which has been shown to be effortful and psychologically as well as physically taxing (McRae, Ciesielski, & Gross, 2012; Muraven, Tice, & Baumeister, 1998). There are many studies demonstrating that self-regulatory resource depletion is
associated with disinhibited eating (see Muraven & Baumeister, 2000, for a review). To the extent that the demands of undergoing a behavioral weight management intervention deplete self-regulatory resources, a similar process likely occurred among participants in the present study. Among high amplifiers, decreased DLPFC activation from pre- to post-diet might reflect this self-regulatory depletion and provide a neural mechanism for the disinhibitory effects of appetizing food images. At the present time, research studies investigating emotion amplification are relatively scarce, and no studies have addressed the relations among effortful emotion amplification (versus a more passive mood induction), brain function, and food consumption. Further research in this area could clarify the unique contributions of the amplification process and the end emotional state to (a) brain response to food cues and (b) eating behavior.

Emotion amplification might also negatively impact self-regulation via the rewarding properties inherent in and associated with food and eating. Elements of food such as the sensory attributes, experienced and anticipated consequences, personal and cultural meanings, and actions of associated agents collectively form the experience of eating (Desmet & Schifferstein, 2008). Food consumption is often associated with heightened affect, such as during celebrations or other social gatherings. This is reflected at a neural level: the visual presentation of food images elicits activity in neural networks that process both properties of the food stimuli themselves, as well as emotional and cognitive associations that have formed in relation to food (Simmons et al., 2005). The hedonic effects and associations of food cues might be especially influential for high relative to low amplifiers, which could lead to greater difficulty effectively regulating food intake both on a day-to-day basis and in situations where energy dense food is present. Thus, it may be critical for high amplifiers in particular to spend additional time
learning how to manage the rewarding aspects of food and food-related occasions.

**Rumination.** In the current study, greater tendency to ruminate was associated with greater pre-diet but lower post-diet activation in regions of the brain implicated in cognitive, emotional, and behavioral self-regulation. Additionally, individuals who endorsed higher levels of rumination showed greater post-diet activation in various limbic and paralimbic brain regions implicated in emotional processing, memory formation, and food motivation. Rumination also correlated inversely with pre-diet activation in a network that modulates flexible behavioral self-regulation, which in turn was associated prospectively with greater weight loss. Collectively, these results suggest that the tendency to ruminate might be associated with psychological and neural processes that interfere with attempts to manage eating behavior and weight.

Rumination is a core feature of depression, such that individuals with a ruminative response style experience longer depressive episodes (Aldao & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2010; Bagby, Rector, Bacchiochi, & McBride, 2004; Nolen-Hoeksema, Morrow, & Fredrickson, 1993). Individuals who experience depression may be more likely to overeat (Ouwens, van Strien, & van Leeuwe, 2009), a relationship that is exaggerated by the presence of obesity (Murphy et al., 2009), especially among women (Stunkard, Faith, & Allison, 2003). Although participants in the present study did not endorse clinically significant levels of depressive symptoms, there is some evidence that “everyday” negative affect arising from daily hassles and work-related rumination is associated with unhealthy food consumption (Cropley et al., 2011; O'Connor, Jones, Conner, McMillan, & Ferguson, 2008). Because rumination is, by definition, distinct from active problem-solving, it tends to amplify and/or prolong negative affect by failing to resolve the distressing circumstances. In this case, individuals are likely to turn to food consumption as a form of distraction and avoidance, initiating and perpetuating a learning process that eating
improves affect (Byrne et al., 2003; Evers et al., 2010; Heatherton & Baumeister, 1991; Heatherton, Striepe, & Wittenberg, 1998; Spoor et al., 2007; Tice, Bratslavsky, & Baumeister, 2001).

Rumination might also negatively impact weight management efforts because it tends to co-occur with cognitive inflexibility and poor problem-solving ability (Davis & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2000; Lyubomirsky et al., 1999; Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991; Whitmer & Banich, 2007). Koster et al. (2011) hypothesized that rumination is characterized by “impaired disengagement” which is evident at a neural level such that heightened limbic and attenuated prefrontal cortex activation contribute to sustained emotion processing. Results from the present analysis are generally consistent with this model: rumination was associated with greater post-meal activation in insula, amygdala, and hippocampal formation. Therefore, this “impaired disengagement” might be especially apparent when an individual with a ruminative response style views food stimuli or consumes food. Greater tendency to engage in rumination is associated with insufficient down-regulation of these emotion processing and food motivation brain regions after eating. Additionally, hypo-activation of a behavioral control network further reflects a pattern of brain activation that interferes with the flexible and creative problem-solving necessary for diet success (Elfhag & Rössner, 2005; Reyes et al., 2012).

**Treatment implications.** There is some evidence to suggest that eating behavior is driven more by habit than by deliberate emotion regulation goals (Adriaanse, de Ridder, & Evers, 2011). In this particular investigation, emotion amplification and rumination might represent habitual ways of responding to affective stimuli, including food, in the environment. In this sense, eating and overeating might represent an emotion-driven behavior that is at times maladaptive or contrary to higher-level goals (Ellard et al., 2010). Thus, personality and
psychological factors might form the “lens” through which these food stimuli are viewed, augmenting certain properties and automatic associations about the food and potentially diminishing others. One treatment approach might be to remove the “lens” and encourage greater objectivity in the processing of food and food-related stimuli; in doing so, previous emotional, cognitive, and behavioral associations are weakened and new learning begins to take place.

A possible treatment modality is mindfulness and/or acceptance, which have a history of positive effects on psychological and physical health. Among fMRI studies, mindfulness and acceptance of negative affect is associated with less activation in emotion generating and elaborating regions such as amygdala, and ventral and medial PFC. Additionally, mindfulness and acceptance have been shown to mediate changes in weight, food-related cognition, and emotional distress (Dalen et al., 2010; Forman, Butryn, Hoffman, & Herbert, 2009; Kristeller & Hallett, 1999; Lillis, Hayes, Bunting, & Masuda, 2009; Niemeier, Leahey, Reed, Brown, & Wing, 2011). In particular, researchers who conducted a set of studies that tested the effect of mindful attention on appetitive response to food cues found that, after practicing mindful attention, participants displayed reduced approach bias toward appetizing food images, both trained and novel (Papies, Barsalou, & Custers, 2011). The authors suggested that engaging in mindful attention practice created a mindset that made it easier for participants to create separation between the stimulus and their reaction to it. Use of these or similar techniques might be especially beneficial for individuals endorsing high levels of emotion amplification and/or rumination.

Limitations

Several limitations of the present study should be acknowledged. The first is that the
participants of the study were all clinically obese, with no healthy weight comparison group in this analysis. Although data were collected from a sample of healthy weight individuals, comparison was beyond the scope of this paper. However, it will be important to investigate how emotion amplification and rumination are related to brain activation in a group of weight stable healthy weight participants. Weight status may be an important moderator of the relationship between emotion processing characteristics and brain response to food cues. Relatedly, the participants in the study were seeking a diet intervention, and results may not be generalizable to a non-diet seeking population.

A second limitation arises from the nature of TEARS as a measure. Because TEARS were designed to capture the process of emotion regulation, irrespective of emotion valence and strategy or strategies employed, assumptions about these factors should be considered with caution. Additionally, questionnaire items were worded in such a way as to be valence neutral; however, participants likely interpreted items to be inquiring about either positive or negative valence, and this may have differed among participants. Moreover, high amplification may be either a reactive or proactive process, and it may occur with varying amounts of effort on the part of the individual. A closer look at the psychological and behavioral correlates of TEARS would help to clarify additional processes contributing to individual differences in emotion regulation.

Similarly, a third limitation relates to the use of the RSQ as a measure of rumination. There are several versions of the RSQ, including the Ruminative Responses Scale (RRS; Treynor, Gonzalez, & Nolen-Hoeksema, 2003), and factor analyses have parsed rumination into multiple constructs with differential associations with depressive symptomatology. On a related note, although the ruminative response style was originally studied with respect to depression, none of the participants in the present investigation met criteria for clinical depression; in fact,
this was an exclusionary criterion. Thus, the ruminative responses endorsed by these participants may differ qualitatively from those endorsed by an individual experiencing clinical depression. It is unclear the extent to which this “true” depressive rumination might be associated with different patterns of brain activation to food cues.

A fourth limitation relates broadly to data analysis methods and interpretation. It should be emphasized that the correlational analyses help to illustrate relationships among personality/psychological variables, brain response to food cues, and weight loss outcomes. However, it is not possible to disentangle to what extent one factor “causes” or is the “effect of” another. Additionally, while not a limitation, findings must be interpreted in the context of the food motivation paradigm and the circumstances surrounding each scanning timepoint. Likewise, amplification and rumination were investigated as correlates but participants were not instructed to amplify emotions or ruminate during scanning.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Despite the aforementioned limitations, this is the first study addressing the relations among brain function, rumination, emotion amplification, and weight-related outcomes using fMRI and a sample of obese individuals undergoing a behavioral weight loss intervention. Participant differences in self-reported emotion amplification and rumination were correlated with differential change in brain response to food images in limbic, paralimbic, and prefrontal cortex. Notably, greater self-reported tendency to ruminate was correlated with less activation in DLPFC and caudate, and activation in these regions was prospectively correlated with more weight loss. These findings suggest that personality and psychological characteristics influence how food stimuli are perceived and processed, which in turn determines behavioral response and ultimately may facilitate or interfere with goal achievement. To the extent that food cue-elicited
responses are automatic or habit-driven, the use of mindfulness and/or acceptance techniques might be beneficial in changing an individual’s relationship with food. A natural direction for future research would be a longitudinal neuroimaging studies investigating both baseline predictors of mindfulness/acceptance treatment success as well as pre-treatment to post-treatment change.
Figure 1. Food motivation paradigm. Participants viewed pictures of Food (F) and animals (A; Nonfood), as well as blurry images (B) created from the food and animal images. This was a block design, with 13 blocks containing 10 images each. Food and animal images alternated with blurry images. Order was counterbalanced so that some scanning sessions began with blurry and food images, and other sessions began with blurry and animal images. Participants were shown each image only one time.
Figure 2. Correlation of brain activation and percent weight change in the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC). Signal change (F–NF) in the left DLPFC ($-27, 50, 22$) was inversely correlated with percent weight change from BL to 3M, such that activation $F>NF$ was correlated with more weight loss, whereas activation $NF>F$ was correlated with less weight loss. Region of interest was defined from the baseline post-meal session correlation of beta value (F–NF) and Rumination score. Coronal (top) and axial (bottom) perspectives of the DLPFC cluster are depicted in radiological convention (left = right).
Figure 3. Correlation of brain activation and percent weight change in the right caudate nucleus. Signal change (F–NF) in the right caudate nucleus (9, –1, 16) was inversely correlated with percent weight change from BL to 3M, such that activation F>NF was correlated with more weight loss, whereas activation NF>F was correlated with less weight loss. Region of interest was defined from the baseline post-meal session correlation of beta value (F–NF) and Rumination score. Coronal (top left), sagittal (top right) and axial (bottom) perspectives of the caudate cluster are depicted in radiological convention (left = right).
Table 1
*Participant Demographics and Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n = 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age at Baseline (SD)</td>
<td>39.02 (7.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean BMI at BL (kg/m²) (SD)</td>
<td>35.16 (3.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent weight change BL to 3M</td>
<td>−11.09 (4.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent weight change 3M to 9M</td>
<td>1.04 (5.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (%) Female</td>
<td>34 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (%) Caucasian</td>
<td>38 (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (%) ≥ Some College Education</td>
<td>47 (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEARS Amplification</td>
<td>23.18 (5.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumination</td>
<td>2.88 (2.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* M = mean; SD = standard deviation; BMI = Body Mass Index; BL = Baseline; 3M = 3-Month Follow-up; 9M = 9-Month Follow-up; TEARS = The Emotion Amplification and Reduction Scales
Table 2
Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BL Age</th>
<th>BL BMI</th>
<th>%WtCh BL-3M</th>
<th>%WtCh 3M-9M</th>
<th>Amplification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL BMI</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%WtCh BL-3M</td>
<td>–.342*</td>
<td>–.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%WtCh 3M-9M</td>
<td>–.170</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplification</td>
<td>–.143</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumination</td>
<td>–.005</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. BL = Baseline timepoint; BMI = Body Mass Index; 3M = 3-month follow-up timepoint; 9M = 9-month follow-up timepoint; %WtCh = percent weight change

*p < .05   **p < .01
Table 3  
*Differences in Questionnaire Scores and Weight Change, by Gender*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males (n=16)</th>
<th>Females (n=34)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38.63 (8.81)</td>
<td>39.21 (7.71)</td>
<td>–.237</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ (WASI)</td>
<td>108.94 (8.37)</td>
<td>115.21 (9.93)</td>
<td>–2.184</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>35.16 (2.88)</td>
<td>35.17 (3.62)</td>
<td>–.008</td>
<td>.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M BMI (kg/m²)</td>
<td>30.07 (2.68)</td>
<td>31.82 (3.60)</td>
<td>–1.728</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Weight Change (BL to 3M)</td>
<td>–14.36 (5.73)</td>
<td>–9.56 (3.47)</td>
<td>–3.094</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Weight Change (3M to 9M)</td>
<td>.18 (6.57)</td>
<td>1.45 (4.51)</td>
<td>–.803</td>
<td>.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEARS Amplification</td>
<td>22.63 (5.12)</td>
<td>23.44 (5.17)</td>
<td>–.523</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumination</td>
<td>1.38 (1.71)</td>
<td>3.56 (2.83)</td>
<td>–2.882</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* BL = Baseline timepoint; BMI = Body Mass Index; 3M = 3-month follow-up timepoint; 9M = 9-month follow-up timepoint;  

*p < .05  **p < .01
Table 4
*Regions Reaching Significance During GLM Contrasts of Food>Nonfood, Correlated with TEARS Amplification Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and contrast</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>mm³</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Diet (BL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angular gyrus</td>
<td>R39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>-.479</td>
<td>0.000435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle temporal gyrus</td>
<td>L39</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>-.542</td>
<td>0.000048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-meal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>-.539</td>
<td>0.000053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle frontal gyrus</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-.480</td>
<td>0.000413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior parietal lobule</td>
<td>R40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>-.551</td>
<td>0.000034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Diet (3M)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior occipital gyrus</td>
<td>L18</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-91</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>-.484</td>
<td>0.000373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-meal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior occipital gyrus</td>
<td>R18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-85</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>-.498</td>
<td>0.000234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. L = left; R = right; BA = Brodmann Area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and contrast</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>mm³</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Diet (BL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>−48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6870</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>0.000018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>R11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>−15</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>0.000006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>−4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>0.000105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precentral gyrus</td>
<td>L44</td>
<td>−51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>0.000185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcentral gyrus</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>−55</td>
<td>−25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>0.000673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>−37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>0.000064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L43</td>
<td>−57</td>
<td>−7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>0.000532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior parietal lobule</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>−12</td>
<td>−61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>0.000476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior parietal lobule</td>
<td>L40</td>
<td>−30</td>
<td>−34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>0.000003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>−37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>−.459</td>
<td>0.000798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fusiform gyrus</td>
<td>R20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>−22</td>
<td>−20</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>−.492</td>
<td>0.000288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuneus</td>
<td>R18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>−70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>0.000059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellum</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>−24</td>
<td>−49</td>
<td>−14</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>0.000222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-meal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L47</td>
<td>−39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>−8</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>−.511</td>
<td>0.000147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L45</td>
<td>−48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>−.491</td>
<td>0.000295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>−27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>−.491</td>
<td>0.000298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>−3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>−.478</td>
<td>0.000445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-.466</td>
<td>0.000646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caudate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>-.536</td>
<td>0.000060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precuneus</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>-.503</td>
<td>0.000200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-.488</td>
<td>0.000324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior parietal lobule</td>
<td>R40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>-.476</td>
<td>0.000472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Inferior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>R21/20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>-.486</td>
<td>0.000349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occipital gyrus</td>
<td>L19</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>-.653</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellum</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>-.529</td>
<td>0.000078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-.480</td>
<td>0.000414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pons</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-.488</td>
<td>0.000321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-Diet (3M)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>-.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precuneus</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>L22</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>-.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle temporal gyrus</td>
<td>R19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-76</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellum</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>-.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstem</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>-.557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-meal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>R45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insula</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parahippocampal gyrus</td>
<td>L -39</td>
<td>R35</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocampus</td>
<td>L -33</td>
<td>L -1</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precuneus</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>L42</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle temporal gyrus</td>
<td>R22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellum</td>
<td>L -21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. L = left; R = right; BA = Brodmann Area
Table 6
Regions Reaching Significance During GLM Contrasts of Timepoint (BL, 3M) × Stimulus Type (Food, Nonfood), Correlated with TEARS Amplification Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and contrast</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>mm³</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-meal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>R9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>0.000186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-meal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>-.493</td>
<td>0.000278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>R22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>0.000020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. L = left; R = right; BA = Brodmann Area
Table 7
*Regions Reaching Significance During GLM Contrasts of Timepoint (BL, 3M) × Stimulus Type (Food, Nonfood), Correlated with Rumination Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region and contrast</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>mm³</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-meal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>−48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11293</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>−30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>0.000026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cingulate gyrus</td>
<td>L24</td>
<td>−3</td>
<td>−10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>0.000219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precentral gyrus</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>−51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>0.000171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precuneus</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>−6</td>
<td>−46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>0.000069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parietal cortex</td>
<td>L40</td>
<td>−27</td>
<td>−37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>0.000054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-meal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>−24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>−.521</td>
<td>0.000104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>−.493</td>
<td>0.000272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>−51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>−.481</td>
<td>0.000401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2896</td>
<td>−.558</td>
<td>0.000025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior cingulate cortex</td>
<td>R32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>−.567</td>
<td>0.000018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parahippocampal gyrus</td>
<td>L36</td>
<td>−24</td>
<td>−31</td>
<td>−17</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>−.567</td>
<td>0.000018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>−28</td>
<td>−17</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>−.499</td>
<td>0.000224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amygdala</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>−21</td>
<td>−7</td>
<td>−8</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>−.489</td>
<td>0.000317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial frontal gyrus</td>
<td>L/R6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3520</td>
<td>−.551</td>
<td>0.000034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>−12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>−.517</td>
<td>0.000123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precentral gyrus</td>
<td>L44</td>
<td>−51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>−.544</td>
<td>0.000044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>−42</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>−.569</td>
<td>0.000016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Hemisphere</td>
<td>MNI Coordinates</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcentral gyrus</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>12 -49 67</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>-.518</td>
<td>0.000116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 -49 64</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>-.462</td>
<td>0.000734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posterior cingulate gyrus</td>
<td>L30</td>
<td>-9 -64 10</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>0.001862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precuneus</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>-9 -52 61</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>-.425</td>
<td>0.002077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior parietal lobule</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>-24 -44 55</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>-.511</td>
<td>0.000148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>R22</td>
<td>51 -10 4</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>-.530</td>
<td>0.000076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R13</td>
<td>54 -43 22</td>
<td>2896</td>
<td>-.558</td>
<td>0.000025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle temporal gyrus</td>
<td>L39</td>
<td>-45 -58 13</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>-.507</td>
<td>0.000173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L21</td>
<td>-66 -34 -14</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-.486</td>
<td>0.000342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Inferior temporal gyrus</td>
<td>L20</td>
<td>-60 -25 -14</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>-.492</td>
<td>0.000288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingual gyrus</td>
<td>R19</td>
<td>18 -49 -5</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-.514</td>
<td>0.000136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebellum</td>
<td>R/L</td>
<td>0 -43 -35</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>-.443</td>
<td>0.001268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. L = left; R = right; BA = Brodmann Area
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