Supporting Information

Irrational exuberance and neural crash warning signals during endogenous experimental price bubbles

Alec Smith[1], Terry Lohrenz[2], Justin King[2], P. Read Montague[2,3], Colin F. Camerer[1]

1. California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA
2. Virginia Tech Carilion Research Institute, Roanoke, VA
3. The Wellcome Trust Centre for Neuroimaging, University College London, UK

Behavioral Results

Market statistics. Table S1 reports summary price and volume statistics at the aggregate and session levels. To enable comparisons with other studies of laboratory asset bubbles we also report summary statistics that measure the extent of deviations from fundamental value: the Relative Absolute Deviation and Relative Deviation for each session.(*1*) Both measures are volume weighted, so that they take into account the number of trades at a given price. Relative Absolute Deviation (RAD) is computed as

$$RAD = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{50} v_t \left(\frac{|p_t - 14|}{14}\right)}{\sum_{t=1}^{50} v_t}$$

and Relative Deviation (RD) is computed as

$$RD = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{50} v_t \left(\frac{p_t - 14}{14}\right)}{\sum_{t=1}^{50} v_t}$$

where p_t is the price in each round t and v_t is the number of units traded in each round. RAD is a measure of "mispricing": an RAD of 0.1 means that the average trade takes place at a price that is 10% different from than fundamental value. RD adds directional measures: an RD of 0.1 means that the average trade takes place at a price that is 10% greater than fundamental value. In our experiments, the mean RAD is 1.050 and the mean RD is 1.047, indicating that the average trade takes place at 104.7% of fundamental value. The mean RAD and mean RD are very close in magnitude because in almost all rounds, the price is greater than fundamental value. For comparison, in the experiments reported by (*2*), the largest reported RAD is 0.414 and the largest observed RD is 0.297, so our experiments produce bubbles of magnitude roughly three times as large.

Scanned vs. behavioral participants. Behavioral participants scored slightly higher on the pre-experiment quiz (Table S1: mean score 3.87 vs. 3.43 for the scanned participants), and this difference is significantly different from 0 at the 5% level using a two-sided t-test for difference in means (n =317, p-value 0.04). However, this difference in quiz performance did not appear to result in a noticeable difference in trading behavior or performance. Figure S2 compares trading activity and payout for the experiment for our two subject populations. This comparison is important because undergoing neuroimaging might affect behavior, so that the behavior of our scanned population might be different in some way from the population of non-scanned behavioral subjects. On average, subjects traded in 19.31 rounds (std. dev. 9.19, range 2-44). The mean payout in the experiment was $20.86 (std. dev. 5.27, range 4.07-45.62). There are no significant differences between the two groups in either the number of trades (p=0.339, Wilcoxon rank-sum test; p = 0.3223, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) or in payouts (p = 0.2164, Wilcoxon rank-sum test; p = 0.1551, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test).

Individual characteristics associated with trading behavior and performance. We used multiple regression analysis to explore whether demographic factors were associated with trading behavior and performance. Table S3 reports the results from ordinary least squares regressions of: (Model 1) payout on demographic variables and quiz scores; (Model 2) Number of trades on demographic variables and quiz scores; (Model 3) Quiz score on demographic variables. The results from Model 1 suggest that the main subject-level variable that influences payouts are task comprehension and trading activity: scoring one additional question right on the pre-experiment quiz is associated with earning an additional \$0.75. On average trading is costly: each additional trade results in an average loss of \$0.14. Note however that the relationship of trades to payouts is nonlinear: the very highest earners (roughly, the highest 20%) trade more than average, as do the lowest earners. Furthermore, any subject can guarantee himself or herself the mean payout in a given session by not trading at all. Cancelled trades, potentially a measure of subject confusion, had a negative but statistically insignificant association with payout. Model 2 suggests that Asian subjects make on average almost 4 more trades than Black or White subjects; and Model 3 shows that on average male subjects score on average almost ½ point higher on the pre-experiment quiz relative to female subjects.

Imaging Protocol

Image acquisition and analysis. The imaging was conducted on three 3.0T Siemens Magentom Trio scanners at the Virginia Tech Carilion Research Institute. Two scanners are located in Roanoke, VA and one in Blacksburg, VA. Two separate cohorts of imaging data were collected for this experiment: one in October 2011 and January 2012, and another in April 2012. The first cohort comprised of 27 healthy subjects recruited in accordance with a protocol approved by the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board. High-resolution T1-weighted scans were acquired using a magnetization prepared rapid gradient echo sequence. Functional imaging were acquired with a repetition time of 2000 ms and an echo time of 30 ms. Twenty-six 4-mm slices were acquired parallel with the anteroposterior commissural line, yielding functional voxels that were 3.4mm x 3.4mm x 4mm. The second cohort of 17 healthy subjects were recruited in the same method and matched the parameters of the high-resolution scans from the initial cohort. Functional images from cohort two were acquired with a repetition time of 2000 ms and an echo time of 25 ms. Thirty-seven 4-mm slices were acquired 30° off the anteroposterior commissural line, yielding functional voxels that were 3.4mm x 3.4mm x 4mm.

Image preprocessing. Images were analyzed using SPM8 (http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm8/). Slice timing correction was first applied to temporally align all the images. Motion correction to the first functional image was performed using a six-parameter rigid-body transformation. Images were subsequently spatially normalized to the Montreal Neurological Institute template by applying a 12-parameter affine transformation, followed by nonlinear warping using standard basis functions. Finally, for GLM analyses, the images were smoothed with an 8 mm isotropic Gaussian kernel and then high-pass filtered (128 s width) in the temporal domain.

Imaging Analyses

General linear model. We initially estimated the following general linear model (GLM) of BOLD responses with an AR(1) structure. In each voxel we regressed the preprocessed, spatially smoothed BOLD signal on (1) Indicators for each each of the four different stimulus screens (Positions, Order Entry, Trading Results, and Dividends and Interest); (2) Separate indicators for trials where subjects bought and sold (i.e., trials where subjects saw "You Bought" or "You Sold" messages); (3) Parametric regressors for the expected dividend yield and the return at the time outcomes are revealed (the "Trading Results" screen). The expected dividend yield in round t is $\mathrm{E}[d_t]/p_t = 0.7/p_t$. Return is defined as $(p_t - p_{t-1})/p_{t-1}$: the fractional change in price from the previous round. All regressors of interest are convolved with a canonical hemodynamic response function (Friston et al., 1998). We also included the time series of 6 head motion parameters estimated from preprocessing as a regressor of no interest, to control for residual head motion in the time series.

Imaging results. An overview of the results from this analysis is given in Table S4. We found strong responses to "You Bought" and "You Sold" messages in the ventral striatum, relative to our baseline of "No Trade" messages (both results are significant at the 5% level, after adjusting significance levels for multiple comparisons across the whole brain using Family Wise Error (FWE) corrections). We found few differences in neural responses to “Buy” and “Sell” messages, even at much more liberal significance thresholds (p-value 0.005, uncorrected), save a small cluster in the middle frontal gyrus for the contrast “Bought”-“Sold”.

We also found that neural activity responded negatively to expected dividend in the ventral striatum and subgenual cingulate cortex. This result is consistent with the analysis in the main text; the expected dividend is the inverse of the price, times a constant. In addition we found neural activity in a number of brain regions associated with theory-of-mind tasks, such as the superior temporal gyrus. We found few neural correlates of return except at very liberal thresholds, where we note a small cluster in the superior temporal gyrus, in a region where neural activity is often associated with theory-of-mind tasks.

Trial to trial data extraction. We extracted the trial-to-trial data as follows: After preprocessing (see above), we filtered the (unsmoothed) time course of BOLD responses in each voxel using a high-pass filter with bandwidth 128s. We then removed any remaining linear trend by regressing the filtered time course in each voxel on a constant and linear time trend and extracting the residuals. Next, we estimated the baseline BOLD responses to each of the four different stimulus screens (Positions, Order Entry, Trading Results, and Dividends and Interest), using a GLM of the BOLD responses with an AR(1) serial correlation structure. The model included regressors for each of the four screens, each convolved with a canonical hemodynamic response function (*3*), as well as the time series of 6 head motion parameters estimated from preprocessing. This model estimates neural responses that are associated with a given stimulus, but not the neural computations that are involved in assessing the stimulus. The (whitened) residuals from this regression capture trial-to-trial variation in BOLD responses.

The next step was to compute, for each subject and each voxel, the neural response to each of the 50 “Trading Results” screens. We approximated the peak hemodynamic response by interpolating between the two volumes acquired closest to 5 seconds after the stimulus onset. The result is a (50 x approximately 25,000 voxels) matrix of data containing the residual variation in BOLD responses to new trading and price information. From this we can examine the trial-to-trial responses in any region of interest. To facilitate cross-subject comparison, we normalized the response in each voxel to have mean 0 and standard deviation 1, then averaged the normalized responses in each region of interest (e.g. the NAcc).

Regions of interest. For the bilateral NAcc region of interest (ROI), we used an anatomical mask consisting of a 6mm-radius sphere centered on MNI coordinates (±12,8,-8). The resulting mask is shown in Figure S2 (Panel A) and contains a total of 24 voxels. This ROI contains the peak signal from the Neurosynth reverse-inference "reward" map (Figure S2B). The map shows regions that are more likely to be reported in studies that use the term "reward" frequently (329 studies of the 5089 in the Neurosynth database as of July 10, 2013) (*4*). The peak z-scores for this reverse-inference map are located at MNI (10,12,-10) (right NAcc) and (-10 , 10 ,-8) (left NAcc). Both locations are contained in our NAcc mask. We also list the top terms from the structure-to-function reverse inference feature map located at the center of our NAcc ROI in Table S5. The table shows terms that appear with high frequency from the 167 studies in the Neurosynth database that report activation within 6 mm of MNI coordinates (12,8,-8). Prominent features at this location include "reward", "incentives", and "feedback".

For the Anterior Insula ROI, we used a 6mm radius sphere, centered on MNI coordinates (36,24,2) located in the right Anterior Insula. These coordinates correspond to the peak "risk prediction" signal from (5), after converting from Talairach to MNI coordinates.

In the interval regressions below (Table S7) we employ as control variables neural activity at the time of the "Trading Results" screen extracted from ROIs in the Amygdala, left Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex (lDLPFC), and right Temporoparietal junction (rTPJ). The Amygdala ROI is based on an the Automated Anatomical Labeling (AAL) Amygdala mask (*6*). The lDLPFC mask is a 6mm-radius sphere centered at MNI (-40,44,18), and the rTPJ sphere is a 6mm-radius sphere centered at MNI (56,-56,16). We also employ an additional ROI, in the left Intraparietal Sulcus (lIPS) as a control region for our brain-behavior association analysis. The lIPS ROI is a 6mm-radius sphere centered on MNI (-31,-62,48).

Brain-Behavior Associations

The scatterplot in Figure 4D in the main text shows that buying when neural activity in the nucleus accumbens is high is associated with low overall profits in the experiment. Similarly, the scatterplot in Figure 4E shows that selling when neural activity is in the right anterior insula is high is associated with higher profits. For both of these analyses, the variable on the x-axis is determined by generating a dependent variable indicating whether the subject bought (or in Figure YY, sold) in round *t*, and then regressing this binary dependent variable on the 5-period moving average of neural activity in the given region of interest at round *t-1*. The x-axis plots the marginal effects from these regressions: the change in probability of buying (or selling) with respect to a 1 unit change in our measure of neural activity. The y-axis in these plots shows each subject's earnings for the experiment, in US dollars.

Figure S3B illustrates that we find no significant brain-buying relationship in the right anterior insula ROI. Figure S4 shows the results from the comparison of both brain-buying and brain-selling relationships with earnings in two additional regions-of-no-interest. Figures S4A and S4B show brain-trading relationships in the rTPJ. Figures S4C and S4D show brain-trading relationships in the lIPS. We selected the rTPJ for its association with theory-of-mind tasks (7), and the lIPS for its association with numerosity (8). We find no significant association between earnings and the neurobehavioral metrics (either brain-buying or brain-selling) from either the rTPJ or lIPS.

Table S6 shows linear regression analyses that illustrate relationships between the NAcc-buying and insula-selling metrics and earnings, with increasing numbers of control variables. Models 1 and 2 show simple linear regressions of earnings on the NAcc-buying association and the insula-selling association, respectively. Model 3 includes both measures and adds subject's score on the pre-experiment quiz. The NAcc-buying association and the insula-selling metrics are each independently statistically significantly associated with task performance. The model in column 4 shows that when increased neural activity in the NAcc is associated with subsequent buying, earnings are lower, and when increased neural activity in the insula is associated with subsequent selling, earnings are higher, after controlling for gender, race, and performance on the pre-experiment quiz.

Interval regression analyses

Model. Our order entry procedure elicits a demand curve for the risky asset, for each subject in each round. We use the elicited orders, namely the highest price to which a subject responds "Buy" and the lowest price to which a subject responds "Sell", to estimate the price at which a subject is indifferent between buying and selling (measured as a percentage of the last period's price).

The experiment protocol presented 5 randomly-ordered stimulus prices each trading round ($s_{it}^k, k \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$). Subjects indicate whether they prefer to buy, hold, or sell if the price is s_{it}^k in round t. We assume that subject i's demand curve $x_i(p_t)$ for the risky asset in round t is downward sloping in the price p_t. Given this assumption there is some price p_{it}^* such that $x_i(p_{it}^*) = 0$. At prices greater p_{it}^*, the subject prefers selling, while at prices lower than p_{it}^*, the subject prefers selling.

To study the determinants of demand for the risky asset, we let $y_{it}^* = (p_{it}^* - p_{t-1})/p_{t-1}$ and assume that $y_{it}^* \sim \mathrm{N}(Z_{it}\gamma, \sigma^2)$ and we estimate the coefficients γ via maximum likelihood. We normalize by the market price in the previous round because the price process, and also the response data, has a unit root. Thus our dependent variable is the price at which a subject is indifferent between buying and selling, expressed as a fraction of the previous round's price.

Define the categorical variable y_{it} as follows:

$$y_{it} = \begin{cases} -1 \; if \; p_{it}^* \leq \min_k s_{it}^k \\ 0 \; if \; \min_k s_{it}^k < p_{it}^* \leq \max_k s_{it}^k \\ 1 \; if \; \max_k s_{it}^k \leq p_{it}^* \end{cases}$$

We define a_{it} as the highest stimulus price s_{it}^k/p_{t-1} to which subject i responds Buy, expressed as a fraction of the previous round's price; and similarly let b_{it} denote the lowest stimulus price s_{it}^k/p_{t-1} to which subject i responds Sell, again normalizing by the previous price; then y_{it}^* lies in the interval $[a_{it}, b_{it}]$ and $y_{it} = 0$. If we observe Buy responses but not Sell responses in round t, then $y_{it}^* \in [a_{it}, +\infty]$ and $y_{it} = 1$. Similarly if there are no Buy responses then $y_{it}^* \in [-\infty, b_{it}]$ and $y_{it} = -1$.

The log-likelihood function is

$$L(\gamma, \sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{t=1}^{50} \begin{Bmatrix} 1[y_{it} = -1] \log\left(\Phi\left(\frac{b_{it} - Z_{it}\gamma}{\sigma}\right)\right) + \\ 1[y_{it} = 0] \log\left(\Phi\left(\frac{b_{it} - Z_{it}\gamma}{\sigma}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{a_{it} - Z_{it}\gamma}{\sigma}\right)\right) + \\ 1[y_{it} = 1] \log\left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{a_{it} - Z_{it}\gamma}{\sigma}\right)\right) \end{Bmatrix}$$

where $1[\cdot]$ is the indicator function and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cumulative distribution function for the standard normal distribution. This approach is known as interval regression (cf. (9)).

Under more restrictive assumptions, we can motivate our regression model with respect to subject's beliefs about future returns. Assume that at time t subjects maximize the constant absolute risk aversion (CARA) utility function $u(W_{t+1}) = -e^{-\rho W_{t+1}}$ where $W_t = c_t + u_t p_t$, c_t is the number of units of the risky asset, u_t is the number of units of the risky asset, p_t is the price in round t of the risky asset, and ρ is a measure of risk aversion. If the total return of the risky asset (including the dividend) is normally distributed, then subject *i*'s demand for the risky asset is:

$$x_{it}(p_t) = \frac{\mathrm{E}_t[p_{t+1} + d_t] - p_t(1+r)}{\rho\sigma^2}$$

When $x_{it}(p_t) = 0$, we have

$$p_{it}^* = \frac{\mathrm{E}_t[p_{t+1} + d_t]}{1+r}$$

so under these (admittedly strong) assumptions our fitted values $\widehat{y_{it}} = Z_{it}\hat{\gamma}$ can be thought of as an approximation of subject i's beliefs regarding the present value of the risky asset. This expression can be generalized to reflect non-myopic plans. The assumption of CARA utility and normally distributed returns is equivalent to assuming that subjects have mean-variance preferences; see e.g. (10), pages 36-37.

Results. Columns 1 and 2 of Table S7 show the direct relationship on valuation of NAcc activity, and returns and dividend yield respectively. Column 3 shows that a 1 standard deviation change in our measure of NAcc activity is associated with a 1.1% increase in willingness to pay for the risky asset, after controlling for return and expected dividend yield.

Motivated by theoretical and experimental research that focuses on asymmetries among market participants as an important factor in driving bubbles, we divided subjects across all experiments into earning terciles. The model in Column 4 interacts the tercile of earnings with NAcc activity, and adds additional controls including the subject's lagged average orders and share position as well as indicators for each 5-round block in the experiment. The model in Column 5 adds a control variable that measures the subject's trading behavior. In many rounds, subjects respond either only "Buy" or only "Sell" to the stimulus prices, so dropping these rounds might result in a considerable loss of power. We therefore code the highest "bin" to which subjects responded "Buy " from 0 to 5, with no buy response in the round coded as 0, and by coding the lowest "bin" to which subjects responded "Sell" from 1 to 6, with no sell response in the round coded as 6. We then calculated the variable "Buy-Sell midpoint" in round *t* by taking the average of these two numbers. This variable is a rough measure of the subject's policy in a given round. In addition, this model adds additional controls for neural activity extracted from ROIs in the right anterior insula, the amygdala, the right temporoparietal junction and the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex. These variables control for the possibility that variations in neural activity across the whole brain, rather than in the NAcc alone, are driving the results. The coefficient estimates from model 5 show that in the lowest earning subjects, a 1-standard deviation change in our measure of NAcc activity is associated with an approximately 2.6% increase in willingness-to-pay for the risky asset a number that is both statistically and economically meaningful. More accurate measures of NAcc activity are likely to improve the precision of this estimate.

Our results concerning the influence of NAcc activity on behavior are robust to different specifications of the dependent variable. Results of roughly the same significance level and magnitude are achieved when we perform: 1) Linear regressions where the dependent variable is the buy-sell midpoint. 2) Tobit regressions where the dependent variable is each subjects' buy orders in a given round, normalized by the prior round's price; alternatively we can use sell orders. 3) Ordered probit regressions where the dependent variable is the bin chosen, again using either the maximum "Buy" response or minimum "Sell" response.

Supplementary Tables and Figures.

	Subject Type			
	Behavioral (n = 276)		fMRI (n = 44)	
Variable	Mean	Std. dev.	Mean	Std. dev.
VTCRI	0.03	0.18	1.00	0.00
Sex	0.46	0.50	0.45	0.50
Asian	0.70	0.45	0.08	0.27
Black	0.02	0.14	0.07	0.26
White	0.27	0.44	0.85	0.36
Age	23.15	4.64	28.43	10.40
Quiz	3.87	1.27	3.43	1.45
Payout	$20.83	5.29	$21.09	5.19
Trades	19.46	9.03	18.34	10.19

Table S1. Subject composition, summary statistics. VTCRI: 1 if subjects participated at Virginia Tech Carilion Research Institute; 0 if subjects participated at UCLA**. Sex:** 0 if Female, 1 if Male**. Quiz:** number of correct answers on the pre-trade quiz. **Payout:** Earnings for participating in the trading experiment, excluding show-up fees. **Trades:** number of times a subject bought or sold in the experiment.

Variable	N(obs)	Mean	Std. Dev.	25%	50%	75%
Price	800	27.797	19.608	15.965	20.005	30.255
Price (max)	16	60.416	35.260	30.810	64.300	71.275
Price (min)	16	13.563	0.687	13.075	13.525	13.760
Price (final)	16	14.717	1.648	13.940	14.125	14.810
Volume	800	0.398	0.126	0.300	0.400	0.455
Rounds with Price >14	16	0.938	0.051	0.920	0.940	0.970
RAD	16	1.050	0.661	0.449	1.090	1.342
RD	16	1.047	0.661	0.446	1.088	1.339

Table S2. Market summary statistics. Price(all): all price observations; Price(max), Price(min) and Price(final) are the maximum, minimum, and final round prices in each session, respectively. Volume (all) is the normalized volume in each session, shown as the fraction of subjects who traded in each round. RAD: Relative Absolute Deviation; RD: relative deviation (see text for details).

Variable	(1) Payout	(2) Dependent Variable Total trades	(3) Quiz score
Sex	41.60	2.324*	0.477***
	(48.61)	(1.271)	(0.156)
VTCRI	65.86	0.923	-0.327
	(68.03)	(2.208)	(0.299)
Quiz Score	74.56**	0.539	
	(30.09)	(0.634)	
Black	-15.40	3.503	-1.295*
	(157.1)	(3.556)	(0.658)
Asian	73.80	3.728**	0.0298
	(54.17)	(1.730)	(0.207)
Total trades	-14.41***		
	(3.839)		
Cancelled trades	-5.972		
	(5.153)		
Constant	2,021***	13.63***	3.662***
	(68.96)	(2.818)	(0.152)
Observations	317	317	317
R-squared	0.093	0.061	0.081
Number of session	16	16	16
Session FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Robust SE	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table S3. Determinants of subject behavior. Fixed-effects regressions**. Sex:** 0 if female, 1 if male. **VTCRI:** subjects participated at Virginia Tech Carillion Research Institute. **Total trades:** number of buy and sell transactions. **Cancelled trades:** trades cancelled either because the subject tried to sell and had 0 units of the risky asset available, or because the subject responded buy to a price that was greater than a price to which the subject responded sell. Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Binary Variables								
Thresholds: p-value FWE 0.05; Cluster Extent k>5						**peak MNI coordinates**		
Variable	**Region**	**R/L**	**Brodmann Area**	**Voxels**	**Peak T**	**x**	**y**	**z**
Bought	Ventral Striatum	R/L	25	8	6.46	-14	8	-14
Sold	Ventral Striatum	R/L	25/47	206	9.05	10	8	-6
	Inferior Temporal Gyrus	R	19	10	6.87	46	-76	-6
	Inferior Frontal Gyrus	L	6/9	72	6.18	-50	8	22
	Orbitofrontal cortex	R	10/11/32	103	5.66	22	48	-10
	Inferior Frontal Gyrus	L	46	12	5.65	-42	32	14
	Inferior Parietal Lobule	L	40	16	5.64	-58	-32	46
	Cuneus	R	17	9	5.30	14	-88	2
	Anterior Cingulate Cortex	R	9/32	11	5.18	10	36	22
Thresholds: p-value: Uncorrected 0.005; Cluster Extent k>5								
Bought-Sold	Middle Frontal Gyrus	R	9	18	3.15	38	8	34
Sold-Bought	No significant clusters							

Parametric Modulator Variables								
Thresholds: p-value: Uncorrected 0.005; Cluster Extent k>5						**peak MNI coordinates**		
Variable	**Region**	**R/L**	**Brodmann Area**	**Voxels**	**peak T**	**x**	**y**	**z**
EDiv	Inferior Parietal Lobule	L	40	30	3.76	-54	-48	42
	Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	22/39	8	3.33	62	-64	14
	Inferior Parietal Lobule	R	40	28	3.25	62	-48	46
	Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	22	10	-3.04	58	8	-2
	Cuneus/Precuneus	R		9	-3.32	18	-84	50
	Middle Frontal Gyrus	L	6	9	-3.55	-50	0	46
	Precuneus	L	19	30	-3.75	-14	-84	46
	Ventral Striatum/ Anterior Cingulate Cortex	L	11/25/32	70	-4.07	-14	12	-14
Return	Superior Temporal Gyrus	R	19/22/39	23	2.70	54	-56	14

Table S4. GLM Results. Bought: indicator for "You Bought" message, convolved with a hemodynamic response function. **Sold:** indicator for "You Sold" message, convolved with a hemodynamic response function. **EDiv:** expected dividend yield (parametric modulator) for the risky asset in round *t*. **Return:** return for the risky asset in round *t*.

Neurosynth Reverse Inference: MNI (12,8,-8)		
Feature	**z-score**	**post. prob.**
reward	19.55	0.92
rewards	13.17	0.92
incentive	11.6	0.93
outcome	11.6	0.87
money	11.13	0.92
anticipation	10.41	0.89
monetary	10.32	0.9
outcomes	9.74	0.88
win	9.13	0.92
feedback	7.95	0.82

Table S5. Neurosynth reverse inference. Showing the 10 features with highest z-score of 525 entries. The table shows terms that appear with high frequency from the 167 studies in the Neurosynth database that report activation within 6 mm of MNI coordinates (12, 8, -8).
Downloaded from http://neurosynth.org/locations/12_8_-8 on July 10, 2013.

			Model	
Dependent Variable is Earnings ($)	**(1)**	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**
NAcc-Buying	-13.49***		-11.06***	-12.47***
	(3.645)		(3.224)	(3.369)
Insula-Selling		11.59***	8.236**	8.053**
		(3.888)	(3.147)	(3.172)
Quiz Score			0.594	0.263
			(0.479)	(0.322)
Black				-8.397**
				(3.538)
White				-0.711
				(3.46)
Sex				0.0456
				(1.291)
Constant	21.65***	19.98***	18.76***	20.82***
	(0.78)	(0.869)	(1.602)	(3.813)
Observations	41	41	41	39
R-squared	0.273	0.215	0.417	0.538

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table S6. Brain-behavior associations in the NAcc and the insula predict task performance. OLS estimates. **NAcc-Buying:** relationship between NAcc activity in the 6mm-radius ROI spheres centered at MNI (±12,8,-8) and subsequent buying. **Insula-Selling** relationship between insula activity in the 6mm radius sphere centered at MNI (36,24,2) and subsequent selling. **Sex:** 0 if female, 1 if male.

	Model				
Variable	**(1)**	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**	**(5)**
NAcc	0.008		0.011**	-0.001	0.002
	(0.005)		(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Low Earns*NAcc				0.037***	0.026***
				(0.011)	(0.009)
Return		0.026***	0.028***	0.020**	0.001
		(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.008)
Dividend Yield		0.022*	0.021	0.047**	0.039**
		(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.023)	(0.016)
Buy-sell midpoint					0.079***
					(0.012)
Units				yes***	yes*
Units=0 (Indicator)				n.s.	n.s.
4 ROIs: rAIns, Amyg, rTPJ, lDLPFC					n.s.
Constant	1.000***	1.001***	1.002***	0.908***	0.932***
Low Earns (Indicator)				0.056***	0.062***
Subject FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5 round dummies	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Cluster level	Subject	Subject	Subject	Subject	Subject
Observations	1745	1829	1745	1745	1745

Table S7. Determinants of valuation for the risky asset. Interval regression estimates. The dependent variable is $[a_{it},b_{it}]$ where a_{it} is the maximum stimulus price to which subject i responded "Buy" in round *t*, and b_{it} is the minimum price to which subject *i* responded "Sell" in round *t*. All independent variables are lagged. NAcc: mean BOLD response in the 24-voxel bilateral Nucleus Accumbens ROI centered at MNI (±12,8,-8). Low Earns: Indicator for subjects in the lowest third of the earnings distribution. Buy-sell midpoint: the midpoint between buy and sell orders. Buy-sell midpoint is the average of the previous round's maximum buy and minimum sell orders by bins, numbered from 1 to 5. Missing buy orders were coded as 0 and missing sell orders coded as 6. Units: units of the risky asset. rAIns: right Anterior Insula. Amyg: Amygdala. rTPJ: right temporoparietal junction. lDLPFC: left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex.
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Cluster-corrected standard errors in parentheses.



Figure S1. Payouts and Trading activity. Each circle represents an individual participant. The light circles are UCLA (behavioral) subjects, and the shade circles represent VT (fMRI) subjects. The x-axis shows the number of trades the subject made, and the y-axis is the subject's payout in the experiment. There are no significant differences between the two groups in either the number of trades ($p=0.339$, Wilcoxon rank-sum test; $p = 0.3223$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) or in payouts ($p = 0.2164$, Wilcoxon rank-sum test; $p = 0.1551$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test).



Figure S2. A) NAcc ROI: Two 6mm-radius spheres centered at MNI (±12,8,-8) in the nucleus accumbens. There are 12 voxels in each sphere. B) **Neurosynth reverse inference feature map.** This reverse inference map shows z-statistics that measure the likelihood that the term "reward" will be associated with a reported activation in a given brain region**.** Image downloaded from http://neurosynth.org/features/reward on July 10, 2013.



Figure S3. A) Insula ROI: A 6mm-radius sphere centered at MNI (36,24,2) in the right anterior insula. **B)** Earnings compared with the estimated brain-buying relationship in the insula. We do not find a statistically significant association between earnings and the degree to which neural activity in the insula predicts buying in the next trading round.



Figure S4. Neurobehavioral control regions. A) Earnings compared with the estimated brain-buying relationship in the rTPJ. **B)** Earnings compared with the estimated brain-selling relationship in the rTPJ. **C)** Earnings compared with the estimated brain-buying relationship in the lIPS. **D)** Earnings compared with the estimated brain-selling relationship in the lIPS.

INSTRUCTIONS

This experiment is about economic decision-making in an experimental market. If you make good decisions, you might earn a considerable amount of money, which will be paid to you in US dollars at the end of the experiment. The experiment will consist of a series of 50 trading periods in which you will have the opportunity to buy or sell shares of an asset that can yield payments in the future.

There are two assets in this experiment: CASH (experimental currency units) and STOCK. You begin with 100 units of CASH and 6 shares of STOCK.

STOCK is traded in a market each period among all the experimental subjects, in units of CASH. When you buy STOCK, the price you agreed to pay is deducted from your amount of CASH. When you sell STOCK the price you sold at is added to your amount of CASH.

Each period, every unit of STOCK earns a low or high dividend of either 0.40 CASH per unit or 1.00 CASH per unit. These dividend payments are equally likely, and are the same for everyone in each period. However, the dividend in each period does not depend on whether the previous dividend was low or high.

CASH earns a fixed interest rate of 5% each period.

At the end of the 50 periods of trading, each unit of STOCK is automatically traded in for 14.00 CASH. Then your experiment CASH units are converted to US dollars at a rate of 100 CASH = $1 US, to determine how much you will be paid at the end of the experiment.

For example, suppose in a period you have 120 units of CASH and 5 units of STOCK, and the dividend is 0.40 per unit of stock. Then your new CASH amount would be a 5% increase times 120 (a gain of 6) and total dividends of 0.40 x 5 = 2. Your total CASH would therefore increase by 6 + 2 = 8 units. Notice that keeping CASH will earn a return (5% per period) and using CASH to buy units of STOCK will also yield dividend earnings. If you are trying to earn the most money you might think about whether keeping CASH or buying STOCK creates more earnings.

Trading

In each period you will be shown a series of 5 prices. You have 2 seconds to make a decision. In response to each price, you must quickly state whether you would BUY 1 unit of stock or SELL 1 unit of stock at that price, or HOLD your current position (not buying or selling). If you do not enter a response in time the default choice that will be made for you is HOLD.

The highest price for which you select BUY and the lowest price for which you select SELL will be entered as “limit orders”. A limit order to buy at a price of 17, for example, means you would like to buy at the price of 17 and *at any lower price*. Similarly, a limit order to sell at 11 means you would like to sell at the price of 11 and *at any higher price*.

After all participants enter orders, a single market price P* is determined which matches the number of people who would like to buy at that price with the same number of people who would like to sell. (That is, the number of limit orders to buy at price P* or higher equals the number of limit orders to sell at price P* or lower.) Participants who responded BUY to prices at or above P* will buy one unit of STOCK at P*. Participants who responded SELL to prices at or below P* will sell one unit of STOCK at P*.

If there are ties in the number of traders who want to buy and sell at exactly P* then a random choice determines which traders will actually BUY or SELL. If there are no orders to BUY, then there are no trades and the last price is reported as the minimum price at which traders would SELL, and if there are no orders to SELL the reported price is the maximum price at which traders would BUY.

<u>Trading restrictions:</u>

Saying that you will BUY at a higher price than you are willing to SELL at is considered a trading mistake, and is not allowed. If this happens your orders will be canceled for that trading period (the same as choosing HOLD).

Also, you must have enough CASH to pay the price of STOCK you would like to BUY. If you do not have enough CASH to buy stocks, your order will be canceled. You also cannot SELL a share of stock if you have no available shares.

<u>Using the keyboard to trade:</u>

Enter SELL by pressing 1, HOLD by pressing 2, and BUY by pressing 3 on your keyboard.

<u>Trading practice:</u>

Before the experiment begins you will have the opportunity to practice trading during 3 practice trading periods. Your decisions during these practice rounds will not count towards your payment for the experiment.

<u>Experiment preview:</u>

Each trial consists of the following screens POSITIONS, ORDER ENTRY, TRADING RESULTS, and DIVIDENDS and INTEREST. Each of these is shown below. In between each screen you will briefly see a fixation cross.

The POSITIONS screen shows your current holdings of STOCK and CASH, the most recent traded price for STOCK, and a price history graph.

The ORDER ENTRY screen is where you enter limit orders. You will see a price. Press 1, 2, or 3 to SELL, HOLD or BUY. You will see this screen 5 times per period.



The TRADING RESULTS screen shows the market price and whether you bought sold, or held that trading period.

The DIVIDENDS and INTEREST screen shows the total dividends you earned that trading period from shares of stock, and the INTEREST you earned that round on your CASH holdings.

Quiz [Correct answers are *in italics*.]

Subject ID: ____________
Session: ____________

1. During order entry you press BUY in response to a price of 8.52 and SELL in response to a price of 7.89. What will happen to your orders for that period?
   a. They'll be entered as usual
   b. They'll be canceled

2. During order entry the <u>highest</u> price to which you respond BUY is 16.78 and the <u>lowest</u> price to which you respond SELL is 17.22. The market price is 16.56 for that period. You will:
   a. BUY one unit at 16.78
   b. BUY one unit at 16.56
   c. SELL one unit at 16.56
   d. SELL one unit at 17.22
   e. Not trade

3. You have 200 units of CASH at the start of a trading period and no STOCK. You do not trade that period. How much CASH do you have at the beginning of the next period?
   a. 200
   b. 205
   c. 210
   d. 190

4. Your account has 5 STOCK and 100 CASH at the start of a trading period, and you do not BUY or SELL during that period. The dividend for that round is 1.00. How much CASH do you have at the start of the next round?
   a. 105
   b. 110
   c. 100
   d. 114

5. After the final trading period, you have 4 remaining units of STOCK. The market price in the final period is 29. How many units of experiment CASH do you receive in exchange for your STOCK?
   a. 4
   b. 29
   c. 56
   d. 116

References

1. T. Stockl, J. Huber, M. Kirchler, Bubble measures in experimental asset markets. *Experimental Economics* **13**, 284 (Sep, 2010).
2. M. Kirchler, J. Huber, T. Stockl, Thar She Bursts: Reducing Confusion Reduces Bubbles. *American Economic Review* **102**, 865 (2012).
3. K. J. Friston *et al.*, Event-Related fMRI: Characterizing Differential Responses. *NeuroImage* **7**, 30 (1998).
4. T. Yarkoni, R. A. Poldrack, T. E. Nichols, D. C. Van Essen, T. D. Wager, Large-scale automated synthesis of human functional neuroimaging data. *Nature methods* **8**, 665 (2011).
5. K. Preuschoff, P. Bossaerts, S. R. Quartz, Neural differentiation of expected reward and risk in human subcortical structures. *Neuron* **51**, 381 (Aug 3, 2006).
6. N. Tzourio-Mazoyer *et al.*, Automated anatomical labeling of activations in SPM using a macroscopic anatomical parcellation of the MNI MRI single-subject brain. *Neuroimage* **15**, 273 (2002).
7. R. Saxe, N. Kanwisher, People thinking about thinking people: the role of the temporo-parietal junction in “theory of mind”. Neuroimage, **19**(4), 1835 (2003).
8. M. Piazza, P. Pinel, D. Le Bihan, and S. Dehaene. "A magnitude code common to numerosities and number symbols in human intraparietal cortex." *Neuron* **53**(2), 293 (2007).
9. J. M. Wooldridge, *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. (MIT Press Books, Cambridge, MA, 2003).
10. K. Back, *Asset pricing and portfolio choice theory*. (Oxford University Press, USA, 2010).