

[Click here to view linked References](#)1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

The enhancement of social norm compliance: prospects and caveats

Claudia Civai¹ & Ili Ma²

¹ School of Psychology, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

² Radboud University, Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour, Centre for Cognitive Neuroimaging, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Abstract

Societies are characterized by a shared system of social norms, which promotes cooperation among people. However, following social norms often means going against self-interest – imagine, for example, being required to choose whether or not to get richer from an unfair deal; ignoring social norms, on the other hand, may elicit disruptive antisocial behaviors that damage human relationships. Therefore, this type of value-based decisions is particularly tough and requires a complex trade-off between self- and other-regarding motivations. The advancement in cognitive neuroscience has shed light on the mechanisms underlying social norm compliance, describing the interplay between the emotional, reward and self-control systems in shaping social norm preference (Fehr & Camerer, 2007). The modulation of these systems, in particular self-control areas like dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC), through TMS and tDCS has proven to be effective in modifying people’s behavior in socio-economic contexts (Knoch et al., 2006; Knoch et al., 2008; Ruff et al., 2013). The scope of the current paper is to discuss the potential benefits of the enhancement of social norm compliance in the context of therapeutic interventions, along with the issues of methodological, theoretical and moral nature that may arise when considering the very definition of social norm: indeed, the benchmark for deciding what is right and what is wrong is not always easy to determine in the social context, and thus the implications of proposing interventions aimed at modulating social norm compliance, although definitely promising, should also be considered carefully.

1
2
3
4 Fairness, reciprocity and cooperation are some of the norms that promote social
5 interactions. In her book "Grammar of Society", Cristina Bicchieri describes social
6 norms as the grammar of social interaction, as they are implicit and define what is
7 acceptable and what is not in a social situation. As a matter of fact, when we make
8 decisions, big or small, that involve other people, we do assume the existence of a
9 shared knowledge of how appropriate human interactions work. The concept of
10 "appropriate interaction" is where the social norms weight in: people vary in the
11 degree of their willingness to follow norms, but, at least within a similar cultural
12 background, people have an intuition of what should be done in social contexts.
13 Social norms specifically apply to those situations in which there is a conflict between
14 self-interest and collective interest. In a behavioral economics mindset, social norms
15 have been related to other regarding preferences, and they are useful to explain the
16 apparent irrationality of individuals' behavior in a number of situations. Indeed,
17 rational utility theories predict that an agent is driven by self-interested goals that
18 aim to maximize the agent's own payoff. However, plenty of experimental evidence
19 showed that people care about others' outcomes: for example, people sometimes
20 sacrifice their own resources for another persons' benefit (Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004).
21 From a cognitive and psychological perspective, social norms and other regarding
22 preferences have been related to constructs such as expectations and emotions. It
23 has been shown that people are more willing to accept unfair offers in the Ultimatum
24 Game when they expect the offer to be unfair; however, when they expect fairness,
25 they are much stricter in their decisions (Sanfey, 2009; Chang & Sanfey, 2013).
26 Fairness judgments seem to be also associated with emotional activation: in fact,
27 negative affect increases our proneness to reject unfair deals (Harle & Sanfey, 2007;
28 Moretti & di Pellegrino, 2010). Neuropsychological models describe social norm
29 perception and compliance as the interplay between different neurocognitive
30 systems, consisting of areas related to emotional activation and expectations (e.g.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 anterior insula: Sanfey et al, 2003; Civai et al, 2012), reward (e.g. ventral striatum:
5
6 Fehr & Camerer, 2007; Tabibnia et al, 2008; Tricomi et al, 2010), evaluation
7
8 (ventromedial prefrontal cortex – VMPFC: Tricomi et al, 2010; Corradi-Dell’Acqua et
9
10 al, 2013), and self-control (dorsolateral prefrontal cortex – DLPFC: Knoch et al,
11
12 2006; Ruff et al, 2013; Baumgartner et al, 2011). Recent studies show
13
14 accumulating evidence to support these accounts, some of which will be described in
15
16 the next paragraphs. Notably, the fact that social norm understanding is rooted in
17
18 our cognitive system means that a disruption of this system, or specific parts of it,
19
20 may lead to a disruption in social norm compliance. Therefore, novel ideas in the
21
22 treatment of judgment and decision-making impairments that involve the use of
23
24 neuromodulation techniques, such as transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS),
25
26 offer a long awaited and welcome societal advancement. The current body of
27
28 research constitutes only the first stage of what hopefully will become a structured
29
30 attempt to bridge laboratory findings and therapeutic interventions. However,
31
32 because of the broad and multifaceted way in which social norms are defined, the
33
34 cognitive enhancement approach to this aspect of cognition is particularly
35
36 challenging. The aim of this short opinion paper is, therefore, to draw attention on
37
38 the specific pitfalls and caveats of the neuromodulation of social norm perception,
39
40 which need to be considered carefully alongside the benefits.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Neuromodulation of social behaviour and its prospects**

48
49 Individuals with psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder fail to
50
51 conform to social norms. They show chronic antisocial behaviour, instrumental
52
53 aggression, lack of remorse, impulsivity, and deceitfulness (APA, 2013; Hare, 1996).
54
55 Multiple theories have been proposed regarding the neural mechanisms of
56
57 psychopathy, including key roles of the amygdala (Blair, 2003; Blair, 2005),
58
59 orbitofrontal cortex - OFC (Birbaumer et al., 2005; Veit et al., 2002), and DLPFC
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (Buckholtz, 2015; Gordon et al., 2004; Muller et al., 2003). For example, individuals
5
6 with psychopathy compared with controls show decreased amygdala responsivity
7
8 during negative outcomes, suggesting impaired aversive conditioning (e.g., Rilling et
9
10 al., 2007; Kiehl et al., 2001). Furthermore, they show increased frontal cortical (e.g.,
11
12 DLPFC) activity during tasks that require emotion recognition, which has been
13
14 suggested to reflect cognitive, rather than emotional processing of emotional stimuli
15
16 (e.g., Gordon et al., 2004; Contreras-Rodriguez et al., 2014). Additionally,
17
18 Buckholtz (2015) proposed a crucial role of DLPFC dysfunction reflecting disrupted
19
20 representation and integration of (social) rules, context, and cost, into computations
21
22 that determine subsequent action selection.
23
24

25
26 tDCS has been suggested to potentially enhance the efficacy of therapeutic
27
28 interventions for psychiatric disorders, as it may boost neuroplasticity (Kuo, Paulus &
29
30 Nitsche, 2014; Cornet, Kogel, Nijman, Raine, & van der Laan, 2013). Clinical
31
32 applications will require a deeper understanding of tDCS effects on the brain,
33
34 including validation, replication, and large-scale trials that measure its effectiveness
35
36 for the applied purpose, as for pharmacological research. The investigation on
37
38 neuromodulation effects on social behaviour is currently at an early stage and has
39
40 been predominantly conducted in healthy individuals, but results so far have been
41
42 auspicious. For example, anodal tDCS applied to the right DLPFC diminished
43
44 proactive aggression in men (Dambacher et al., 2015). Transcranial magnetic
45
46 stimulation (TMS) and tDCS studies on social norm perception mostly aimed at
47
48 understanding the neural circuits by disrupting the function of specific regions,
49
50 thereby hampering social norm compliance: studies using rTMS (van't Wout et al,
51
52 2005; Knoch et al, 2006) found that interfering with the activation of the DLPFC
53
54 during an Ultimatum Game task decreases the chances of rejecting unfair offers.
55
56 Similar effects have been demonstrated using cathodal tDCS (Knoch et al, 2008).
57
58 Together, these findings suggest that the DLPFC modulates self-other regarding
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 preferences: in particular, Knoch et al suggest that self control processes,
5
6 underpinned by DLPFC, are necessary in order to overcome self-interested
7
8 motivations of accumulating money (accepting unfair offers) and favour fairness-
9
10 driven choices (rejecting unfair offers). More recently however, other studies
11
12 employed neuromodulation to enhance social norm compliance or, more in general,
13
14 the effects of social learning. For example, a very promising study by Ruff et al
15
16 (2013) showed that changing the neural excitability of the right lateral prefrontal
17
18 cortex through tDCS enhanced both voluntary and sanction-induced social norm
19
20 compliance, suggesting that these results may be a starting point for developing
21
22 interventions to deal with impairments in social behaviour. Another recent study by
23
24 Ligneul et al (2016) showed that activation of the rostromedial PFC was positively
25
26 associated with positive (victory) and negatively with negative (defeat) prediction
27
28 errors in a perceptual decision-making game where participants competed against
29
30 others. Anodal tDCS over the rostromedial PFC enhanced social dominance learning
31
32 from victories but not defeat. Interestingly, tDCS effects were specific for learning
33
34 about social dominance relationships but did not significantly modulate non-social
35
36 learning in a control task.
37
38
39

40
41 In summary, these studies are promising for future research using tDCS and
42
43 encourage investigations on the clinical applications for antisocial behaviour.
44
45 However, we also would like to propose caution with the use of neurostimulation in
46
47 relation to social norm compliance for the reasons that follow.
48
49
50

51 **Caveats**

52
53 The first ramification that we propose to carefully consider when thinking
54
55 about interventions employing neuromodulation relates to generalization issues.
56
57 Using neuromodulation to create a bias towards one type of behaviour may appear
58
59 beneficial in a specific, well-controlled (laboratory) environment; however, such a
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 bias may be costly to the brains' ability to flexibly adapt our goals and behaviour to a
5
6 more dynamically changing environment. This notion is not specific to tDCS or TMS,
7
8 but also extends to psychopharmacological interventions that aim to enhance
9
10 cognition, and it was recently demonstrated in a methylphenidate study by Ter
11
12 Huurne et al. (2015) using a visuospatial attention task where facial targets were
13
14 either paired with low salient distractors (scrambled faces), or high salient distractors
15
16 (non-scrambled faces). Salient distractors caused interference in both placebo and
17
18 methylphenidate conditions but significantly more in the methylphenidate condition
19
20 compared with placebo, suggesting that methylphenidate enhanced attention to the
21
22 target, but its effect was detrimental when stimulus features were shared by
23
24 distractors and targets. Biases towards one behavior may be costly for flexible
25
26 adaptation to the environment, and, more in general, for other cognitive functions,
27
28 as it has been discussed in Iuculano & Cohen Kadosh (2013): findings show that
29
30 numeric learning was enhanced by the transcranial electrical stimulation (TES) of the
31
32 posterior parietal cortex and impaired by the TES of the dorsolateral prefrontal
33
34 cortex, whereas the reverse was true for automaticity for learned material. This
35
36 argument furthermore outlines a potential harmful consequence of uncontrolled long-
37
38 term tDCS use (also see diytdcs.com), in addition to previously reported risks of
39
40 adverse effects (Brunoni et al., 2012). Despite not being specific for social norm
41
42 perception, this issue is particularly valid for this topic given the complex and flexible
43
44 nature of social norms, which are extremely susceptible to the smallest change in the
45
46 environment: a behavior that is in line with a norm may turn out to be inefficient, or
47
48 even inappropriate, as the context changes. For example, rejecting unfair deals in
49
50 order to pursue fairness is a useful social norm-driven behavior; however, what is
51
52 perceived as fair depends on a complex and individual-specific network of areas
53
54 related to emotion, cognitive control, memory (Chang & Sanfey, 2009). This
55
56 suggests that any interference with one of these systems may lead to a wrong
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 interpretation of the situation or of our own current motivations. Let us now discuss
5
6 more in detail the complex and flexible nature of social norms.
7

8
9 The second ramification is specific to our topic, and it relates to the potential
10 difficulty in determining a benchmark for social norms. Even if laboratory settings are
11 deemed to be cold and not completely reliable for eliciting social interaction, they are
12 useful for controlled manipulation of the variables at play and reveal the response
13 that was expected by the participant (Falk & Heckman, 2009). Clearly, the world is
14 much more complex, and this complexity makes it more difficult to control for the
15 effects of contextual factors in real life: cues can be left unattended, or they may be
16 read differently, goals can differ, and this diversity can elicit different behaviours,
17 which may not necessarily indicate impairment in social norm compliance, but rather
18 the application of a different norm, or the application of the same norm in another
19 direction. For example, if someone accepts a low unfair offer in an Ultimatum Game,
20 we may conclude that they are not sensitive to social context, and more driven by
21 self-interested motivations rather than by social norms; however, what if they need
22 the money for charitable fundraising? What if they think that, for some reason, they
23 deserve less than their opponents? What if they expect that the majority of people in
24 their situation accept any offer? The acceptance behaviour, in this cases, acquires a
25 different meaning. It is true that some norms may be more fixed than others, by
26 being rooted more deeply in our moral value system: indeed, Bicchieri (2006; 2008)
27 and Elster (2009) draw a distinction between social and moral norms. The idea is
28 that, while social norms are followed conditionally upon satisfaction of expectations,
29 moral norms are followed unconditionally, and thus are less sensitive to the context;
30 examples of moral norms involve contemplating murder or incest. Nevertheless, first
31 of all it is worth noting that the norms considered in the context of this discussion
32 (e.g., reciprocity, fairness, honesty) are defined as social by Bicchieri and as quasi-
33 moral, rather than moral, by Elster. Secondly, we could argue that even moral norms
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 are, to a certain extent, influenced by the cultural and historic context: for example,
5
6 moral norms concerning homosexuality have changed dramatically in the last 50
7
8 years. Lastly, the distinction between social and moral is based not on the content of
9
10 the norm, but on our attitude towards it (Bicchieri, 2006), making certain norms
11
12 even harder to categorize. It is challenging to develop interventions when the
13
14 dividing line between a right and a wrong answer can easily get blurred.
15
16
17

18 **Conclusions**

20
21 We conclude by saying that, in pointing out caveats, our intent is to
22
23 encourage research on social norm compliance, both in laboratory and, in the future,
24
25 also in applied settings. In particular, as far as clinical settings are concerned, it will
26
27 be of great importance to come up with an operational definition of social norm, or
28
29 social norm impairment, that can tackle the complexity of the cognitive and brain
30
31 networks involved in this type of processing, in order to define benchmarks for
32
33 successful interventions. Clearly the employment of neuromodulation, in particular
34
35 tDCS, is becoming increasingly common not only in research and clinical practice,
36
37 but also outside these controlled environments, and for this reason studies that can
38
39 contribute to the advancements in the theory of social norms and data interpretation
40
41 should be welcome and encouraged.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **References**

54
55 American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *DSM 5*. American Psychiatric Association.
56
57 Baumgartner, T., Knoch, D., Hotz, P., Eisenegger, C., & Fehr, E. (2011). Dorsolateral
58
59 and ventromedial prefrontal cortex orchestrate normative choice. *Nature*
60
61 *neuroscience*, 14(11), 1468-1474.
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 Bicchieri, C. (2005). *The grammar of society: The nature and dynamics of social*
6 *norms*. Cambridge University Press.

7
8
9 Bicchieri, C. (2008). The fragility of fairness: An experimental investigation on the
10 conditional status of pro-social norms. *Philosophical Issues*, 18, 229–248.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Birbaumer, N., Veit, R., Lotze, M., Erb, M., Hermann, C., Grodd, W., & Flor, H. (2005). Deficient fear conditioning in psychopathy: a functional magnetic resonance imaging study. *Archives of general psychiatry*, 62(7), 799-805.

Blair, R. J. R. (2005). Applying a cognitive neuroscience perspective to the disorder of psychopathy. *Development and psychopathology*, 17(03), 865-891.

Blair, R. J. R. (2003). Neurobiological basis of psychopathy. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 182(1), 5-7.

Brunoni, A. R., Nitsche, M. A., Bolognini, N., Bikson, M., Wagner, T., Merabet, L., ... & Ferrucci, R. (2012). Clinical research with transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS): challenges and future directions. *Brain stimulation*, 5(3), 175-195.

Buckholtz, J. W. (2015). Social norms, self-control, and the value of antisocial behavior. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 122-129.

Chang, L. J., & Sanfey, A. G. (2009). Unforgettable Ultimatums? Expectation Violations Promote Enhanced Social Memory Following Economic Bargaining. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 3, 36.
<http://doi.org/10.3389/neuro.08.036.2009>

Chang, L. J., & Sanfey, A. G. (2013). Great expectations: neural computations underlying the use of social norms in decision-making. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience*, 8(3), 277-284.

Civai, C., Crescentini, C., Rustichini, A., & Rumiati, R. I. (2012). Equality versus self-interest in the brain: differential roles of anterior insula and medial prefrontal cortex. *Neuroimage*, 62(1), 102-112.

Contreras-Rodríguez, O., Pujol, J., Batalla, I., Harrison, B. J., Bosque, J., Ibern-Regàs, I., ... & Pifarré, J. (2014). Disrupted neural processing of emotional faces in psychopathy. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience*, 9(4), 505-512.

Cornet, L. J., de Kogel, C. H., Nijman, H. L., Raine, A., & van der Laan, P. H. (2014). Neurobiological Factors as Predictors of Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy Outcome in Individuals With Antisocial Behavior A Review of the Literature. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, 58(11), 1279-1296.

Corradi-Dell'Acqua, C., Civai, C., Rumiati, R. I., & Fink, G. R. (2013). Disentangling self-and fairness-related neural mechanisms involved in the ultimatum game: an fMRI study. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience*, 8(4), 424-431.

Dambacher, F., Schuhmann, T., Lobbestael, J., Arntz, A., Brugman, S., & Sack, A. T. (2015). Reducing proactive aggression through non-invasive brain stimulation. *Social cognitive and affective neuroscience*, nsv018.

1
2
3
4
5 Elster, J. (2009). Social norms and the explanation of behavior. In P. Hedström & P.
6 Bearman (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of analytical sociology* (pp. 195–217). Oxford:
7 Oxford University Press.
8

9
10 Falk, A., & Heckman, J. J. (2009). Lab experiments are a major source of knowledge
11 in the social sciences. *science*, 326(5952), 535-538.
12

13 Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004). Third-party punishment and social
14 norms. *Evolution and human behavior*, 25(2), 63-87.
15

16 Fehr, E., & Camerer, C. F. (2007). Social neuroeconomics: the neural circuitry of
17 social preferences. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 11(10), 419-427.
18

19 Gordon, H. L., Baird, A. A., & End, A. (2004). Functional differences among those
20 high and low on a trait measure of psychopathy. *Biological psychiatry*, 56(7), 516-
21 521.
22

23 Hare, R. D. (1996). Psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder: A case of
24 diagnostic confusion. *Psychiatric Times*, 13(2), 39-40.
25

26 Harlé, K. M., & Sanfey, A. G. (2007). Incidental sadness biases social economic
27 decisions in the Ultimatum Game. *Emotion*, 7(4), 876.
28

29
30 Iuculano, T., & Kadosh, R. C. (2013). The mental cost of cognitive enhancement. *The*
31 *Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(10), 4482-4486.
32

33 Kiehl, K. A., Smith, A. M., Hare, R. D., Mendrek, A., Forster, B. B., Brink, J., & Liddle,
34 P. F. (2001). Limbic abnormalities in affective processing by criminal psychopaths as
35 revealed by functional magnetic resonance imaging. *Biological psychiatry*, 50(9),
36 677-684.
37

38 Knoch, D., Pascual-Leone, A., Meyer, K., Treyer, V., & Fehr, E. (2006). Diminishing
39 reciprocal fairness by disrupting the right prefrontal cortex. *Science*, 314(5800),
40 829-832.
41

42 Knoch, D., Nitsche, M. A., Fischbacher, U., Eisenegger, C., Pascual-Leone, A., & Fehr,
43 E. (2008). Studying the neurobiology of social interaction with transcranial direct
44 current stimulation—the example of punishing unfairness. *Cerebral Cortex*, 18(9),
45 1987-1990.
46

47
48 Kuo, M. F., Paulus, W., & Nitsche, M. A. (2014). Therapeutic effects of non-invasive
49 brain stimulation with direct currents (tDCS) in neuropsychiatric diseases.
50 *Neuroimage*, 85, 948-960.
51

52 Ligneul, R, Obeso, I., Ruff, C., & Dreher, J. C. (2016). Dynamical representation of
53 dominance relationships in the human medial prefrontal cortex. *Current Biology*.
54

55 Moretti, L., & Di Pellegrino, G. (2010). Disgust selectively modulates reciprocal
56 fairness in economic interactions. *Emotion*, 10(2), 169.
57

58
59 Müller, J. L., Sommer, M., Wagner, V., Lange, K., Taschler, H., Röder, C. H., ... &
60 Hajak, G. (2003). Abnormalities in emotion processing within cortical and subcortical
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 regions in criminal psychopaths: evidence from a functional magnetic resonance
5 imaging study using pictures with emotional content. *Biological psychiatry*, 54(2),
6 152-162.

7
8 Sanfey, A. G., Rilling, J. K., Aronson, J. A., Nystrom, L. E., & Cohen, J. D. (2003).
9 The neural basis of economic decision-making in the ultimatum
10 game. *Science*, 300(5626), 1755-1758.

11
12 Sanfey, A. G. (2009). Expectations and social decision-making: biasing effects of
13 prior knowledge on Ultimatum responses. *Mind & Society*, 8(1), 93-107.

14
15 Rilling, J. K., Glenn, A. L., Jairam, M. R., Pagnoni, G., Goldsmith, D. R., Elfenbein, H.
16 A., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2007). Neural correlates of social cooperation and non-
17 cooperation as a function of psychopathy. *Biological psychiatry*, 61(11), 1260-1271.

18
19 Ruff, C. C., Ugazio, G., & Fehr, E. (2013). Changing social norm compliance with
20 noninvasive brain stimulation. *Science*, 342(6157), 482-484.

21
22 Tabibnia, G., Satpute, A. B., & Lieberman, M. D. (2008). The sunny side of fairness
23 preference for fairness activates reward circuitry (and disregarding unfairness
24 activates self-control circuitry). *Psychological Science*, 19(4), 339-347.

25
26 ter Huurne, N., Fallon, S. J., van Schouwenburg, M., van der Schaaf, M., Buitelaar,
27 J., Jensen, O., & Cools, R. (2015). Methylphenidate alters selective attention by
28 amplifying salience. *Psychopharmacology*, 232(23), 4317-4323.

29
30 Tricomi, E., Rangel, A., Camerer, C. F., & O'Doherty, J. P. (2010). Neural evidence
31 for inequality-averse social preferences. *Nature*, 463(7284), 1089-1091.

32
33 van't Wout, M., Kahn, R. S., Sanfey, A. G., & Aleman, A. (2005). Repetitive
34 transcranial magnetic stimulation over the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex affects
35 strategic decision-making. *Neuroreport*, 16(16), 1849-1852.

36
37 Veit R, Flor H, Erb M, Hermann C, Lotze M, Grodd W, Birbaumer N (2002): Brain
38 circuits involved in emotional learning in antisocial behavior and social phobia in
39 humans. *Neurosci Lett* 328:233-236.