1 Mapping Connectional Differences between Humans and Macaques 2 in the Nucleus Accumbens Shell-Core Architecture

3 Running title: Cross-Species Comparison of the Acb

4 Xiaoluan Xia^{1, 2, †}, Lingzhong Fan^{2, 3, †}, Chen Cheng^{1, 2}, Luqi Cheng^{2, 5}, Long Cao^{2, 5},
5 Bin He^{2, 6}, Junjie Chen¹, Haifang Li^{1, *} and Tianzi Jiang^{2, 4, 5, 7, 8, *}

6 ¹ College of Information and Computer, Taiyuan University of Technology, Jinzhong
7 030600, China

8 ² Brainnetome Center, Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
9 Beijing 100190, China

10 ³ School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences,
11 Beijing 100190, China

12 ⁴ National Laboratory of Pattern Recognition, Institute of Automation, Chinese
13 Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

14 ⁵ The Clinical Hospital of Chengdu Brain Science Institute, MOE Key Lab for
15 Neuroinformation, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China,
16 Chengdu, 625014, China

17 ⁶ School of Mechanical and Power Engineering, Harbin University of Science and
18 Technology, Harbin 150080, China

19 ⁷CAS Center for Excellence in Brain Science and Intelligence Technology, Institute
20 of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

1 ⁸ The Queensland Brain Institute, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072,

2 Australia

3 [†] Co-first author

4 ^{*} Co-correspondence author

5 Tianzi Jiang, Brainnetome Center, Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of

6 Sciences, Beijing 100190, China; E-mail: jiangtz@nlpr.ia.ac.cn; Tel: +86 10 8254

7 4778; Fax: +86 10 82544777.

8 Or

9 Haifang Li, College of Computer Science and Technology, Taiyuan University of

10 Technology, Taiyuan 030600, China; E-mail: lihaifang@tyut.edu.cn; Tel: +86 153

11 4068 2795.

12

1 **Abstract**

2 Two nucleus accumbens subregions, the shell and core, differ in the patterns whereby
3 they integrate signals from prefrontal and limbic areas of the brain. In this study, we
4 investigated whether the disproportionate volumetric differences of these brain areas,
5 particularly the prefrontal cortex, between humans and macaques are accompanied by
6 unique modifications of their macroscopic integrative connections with the shell and
7 core. More specifically, we characterized the tractographic connectivity profiles of the
8 human and macaque shell-core architecture and compared them between the two
9 species. To make the cross-species comparisons more viable, we used the same
10 whole-brain voxel-wise tractography-defined shell-like and core-like divisions in the
11 two species as seeds and delineated pairs of interspecies connectionally comparable
12 (ICC) target regions based on the similarity of the resting-state functional connectivity
13 profiles for the two species, and finally used these seeds and ICC targets to establish a
14 fingerprint-based common space for cross-species comparisons. Our results revealed
15 that dissimilar structural connectivity profiles were found in the prefrontal but not the
16 subcortical target group. We further localized this difference to specific targets to infer
17 possible functional modifications between the two species.

18 **Keywords:** primate comparative neuroimaging; common space approach; homolog;
19 connectivity; primate evolution

20

1 Introduction

2 The nucleus accumbens (Acb) is believed to integrate mnemonic and emotional
3 signals from the prefrontal and limbic regions, helping organisms to achieve
4 motivationally relevant goals by facilitating action selection, e.g., procuring things
5 worth having or avoiding aversive consequences. Furthermore, in part because of
6 their distinct structural and functional connectivity profiles, the well-documented Acb
7 subregions, the shell and core, appear to promote distinct patterns of behavior during
8 action selection (Floresco, 2015). Specifically, the shell receives prominent
9 glutaminergic projections from the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (PFC), subiculum,
10 CA1 fields of the hippocampus (HIPPO), and parvicellular basolateral amygdala
11 (AMYG) as well as small dopaminergic projections from the ventral tegmental area
12 and functionally plays a role in suppressing low- or non-rewards stimuli that may
13 interfere with the best available reward-predicting stimuli utilizing value-driven
14 decision making (Groenewegen et al., 1987; Wright and Groenewegen, 1996;
15 Heidbreder and Groenewegen, 2003; Stopper and Floresco, 2011). The core, however,
16 receives prominent projections from the prelimbic cortex and magnocellular
17 basolateral AMYG as well as small dopaminergic projections from the substantia
18 nigra and functionally plays a role in selectively instigating an approach toward an
19 incentive stimulus associated with the best available reward after Pavlovian cue
20 encoding (Parkinson et al., 2000; Cardinal and Everitt, 2004; Bjorklund and Dunnett,
21 2007; Basar et al., 2010; Salgado and Kaplitt, 2015; Floresco, 2015).

1 Similar interspecies microanatomical features and whole-brain axonal projection
2 patterns of subareas in the primate Acb have been qualitatively described ([Rigoard et](#)
3 [al., 2011](#); [Wedeen et al., 2012](#); [Jbabdi et al., 2013](#); [Balsters et al., 2019](#)), and
4 evolutionarily conserved functions have been suggested for them ([Izawa et al., 2003](#);
5 [Calipari et al., 2012](#); [Daniel and Pollmann, 2014](#)) and used as *a priori* knowledge for
6 further studies ([Neubert et al., 2015](#); [Heilbronner et al., 2016](#)). However, whether
7 these conserved functions are supported by macroscopic structural connectivity given
8 the disproportionate volumetric changes during primate evolution in the brain regions
9 that project to the Acb ([Carlén, 2017](#); [Smaers et al., 2017](#)) and the prefrontal white
10 matter ([Schoenemann et al., 2005](#)) has not been established. In addition, researchers
11 found that the striatum, the parent structure of the Acb, presented species differences
12 in regional gene expression ([Sousa et al., 2017](#)) and exceptional volumetric changes
13 during primate evolution ([Barger et al., 2014](#)). All these seem to support the idea that
14 there may be unique modifications of the structural connectivity of the Acb shell-core
15 architecture, thereby leading to changes in the functions of these Acb subregions.

16 Quantitative interspecies comparison of structural and functional connectivity has
17 proven to be challenging ([Jbabdi et al., 2013](#); [Mars et al., 2014](#)). Compared to
18 traditional comparative anatomy, comparative neuroimaging using magnetic
19 resonance imaging (MRI) allows us to make large-scale comparative analyses and is
20 one of the few techniques that can truly bridge the gap between species by identical
21 non-invasive data acquisition and data handling ([Thiebaut de Schotten et al., 2018](#)).
22 Comparative MRI is an effective tool for characterizing multimodal connectivity

(Jbabdi et al., 2015; Cloutman and Lambon Ralph, 2012) and has been used to describe species differences in specific fiber pathways (Rilling et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2013; Hecht et al. 2015; Folloni et al., 2019) and whole-brain connectivity profiles (Mars et al., 2016, 2018a, 2018b; Neubert et al., 2015). Especially for the latter, the connectivity fingerprint (or its variant, e.g., the blueprint) framework has been used to establish a common space in which a brain area's connectivity profiles characterized in different brains can be aligned and compared between species (Mars et al., 2016, 2018a, 2018b). Such fingerprint-based common space approaches fully exploit the possibilities offered by neuroimaging techniques but have a methodological bottleneck, i.e., how to improve the commonness and representation resolution of the common space to make the approaches more persuasive. For example, there are currently no atlases that allow us to directly extract homologous cortical regions to establish fingerprint-based common spaces for reasonable cross-species comparison.

In this study, we explored the hypothesis that the structural connectivity profile of the Acb shell-core architecture, if characterized by connections with the highly developed PFC regions as well as with the subcortical structures, might differ between humans and macaques because of differences in their evolutionary paths. Compared with mixed comparative approaches (e.g., tracing vs. tractography), as was done in previous studies (Jbabdi et al., 2013; Donahue et al., 2016), we decided that 1) holistic connectivity features-defined brain regions of interest (ROIs) were the best brain nodes for structural and functional connectivity analyses and that 2) using homologous, or at least interspecies connectionally comparable (ICC), regions to

1 characterize the nodes' connectivity profiles for cross-species comparisons
2 represented a more reasonable approach. Therefore, we first generated the shell-like
3 and core-like regions based on whole-brain tractography in the two species as seeds
4 and delineated pairs of ICC targets based on the similarity between their resting-state
5 functional connectivity (rsFC) profiles. We used these ICC targets to characterize the
6 seeds' structural connectivity profiles in the two species and compared them using a
7 fingerprint-based common space approach. We also analyzed the possible differences
8 in single structural connectivities.

1 **Materials and Methods**

2 **Subjects, MRI Data Acquisition, and Overall Processing Flow**

3 We extracted a human MRI dataset (40 subjects; ages: 22-35; 22 males) from the
 4 Human Connectome Project ([Van Essen et al., 2013](#)) and preprocessed the diffusion
 5 (3.0 T MRI scanner; acquired using a multi-shell approach at a 1.25 mm isotropic
 6 resolution) and resting-state functional MRI (rsfMRI; 2 mm isotropic resolution;
 7 1,200 time points) data in an earlier study ([Xia et al., 2017](#)). In this study, we used
 8 these diffusion images to generate the human seeds, i.e., the Acb shell-like and
 9 core-like divisions, based on whole-brain voxel-wise tractography (Fig. 1A). Then,
 10 we checked the data quality and availability of the rsfMRI data (see [Supplemental](#)
 11 [section 1](#)) and used them to select targets and to delineate the ICC targets (Fig. 1B).
 12 Finally, we used the diffusion images to characterize the structural connectivity
 13 profiles of the human seeds for cross-species comparisons (Fig. 1C).

14 Two rhesus macaque MRI datasets, a high-resolution *ex vivo* macaque MRI
 15 dataset (MMDS1; 8 subjects; ages: 4, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 15, 23 years; 2 males) and an *in*
 16 *vivo* macaque MRI dataset (MMDS2; 24 subjects; ages: 3.2-4.4 years; body weight:
 17 5.2-6.887 kg; 20 males), from earlier studies ([Xia et al., 2019a, 2019b; Wang et al.,](#)
 18 [2017](#)) were included in this analysis. We had checked the data quality and availability
 19 of the low *b*-value diffusion images in MMDS1 (9.4 T animal MRI system; TR/TE =
 20 9800/21.8 ms; voxel sizes = 0.6×0.6×0.6577 mm; 60 diffusion-weighted images, *b* =
 21 1000 s/mm² and 4 non-diffusion-weighted images) to ensure that they could be used

1 to perform the tractographic analysis and used them to define the shell-like and
2 core-like regions based on whole-brain voxel-wise tractography (Xia et al., 2019b). In
3 this study, we extracted these Acb parcels as the macaque seeds (Fig 1A), while using
4 the diffusion images in MMDS2 (3.0 T; voxel sizes = 1.5×1.5×0.65 mm; 63
5 diffusion-weighted images, $b = 1000$ s/mm² and 1 non-diffusion gradients acquisition)
6 to test the reproducibility of this dichotomous Acb subdivision. Similarly, we
7 checked the data quality and availability of the rsfMRI data in MMDS2 (240 volumes;
8 voxel sizes = 1.803×1.803×1.8 mm; see Supplemental section 1) and used them to
9 define targets and to delineate the ICC targets (Fig. 1B). Finally, we used the
10 diffusion images in MMDS1 to characterize the structural connectivity profiles of the
11 macaque seeds for cross-species comparisons (Fig. 1C). The preprocessing steps
12 (Supplemental section 2) for the macaque MRI data were identical to those used for
13 the human MRI data to mitigate the influence of different preprocessing steps on the
14 cross-species comparison.

15
16 **Figure 1.** Overall approach of the study. (A) Definition of the seeds. We used whole-brain voxel-wise
17 tractography-based parcellation procedure to generate the human and macaque seeds, i.e., the shell-like
18 and core-like divisions. (B) Definition of the ICC targets in the PFC. Based on the structural and

functional connectivity strength with the seeds, we pre-selected many targets from the existing atlases and then redefined their boundaries using a fingerprint-based common space approach to generate the ICC targets for the two species. (C) Cross-species comparisons. We used these ICC targets to characterize the structural connectivity profiles of the seeds in the two primate brains for cross-species comparison. Additional experiments and checks were run on some steps and are marked using ‘*a*, *b*, *c*, and *d*’.

Tractography-defined Seeds of the Shell and Core

Although it is relatively new, tractography-based parcellation is a mature method (Eickhoff et al., 2015, 2018; Fan et al., 2016; see Li et al., 2017 and Supplemental section 3 for details) that has previously been used to generate human and macaque Acb connection units (i.e., a region consisting of voxels with similar structural connectivity features) by parcellating the striatum (Xia et al., 2019a). In this study, we further parcellated these Acb connection units to define the shell and core connection units in the two species. Specifically, we parcellated the human Acb connection unit, rather than the previously used microanatomically delineated Acb region (Baliki et al., 2013; Xia et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2018), to generate the shell-like and core-like divisions. We had previously parcellated the macaque Acb connection unit into shell-like and core-like divisions based on whole-brain voxel-wise tractography using the high-resolution diffusion images in MMDS1 (Xia et al., 2019b). In this study, we directly extracted these Acb parcels as seeds for the subsequent analysis and repeated

1 this procedure using the low-resolution diffusion images in MMDS2 to validate the
2 reproducibility of the parcellation results (Fig. 1a).

3 **Constructing Fingerprint Frameworks**

4 The fingerprint framework was constructed using a group of targets that met two
5 criteria: 1) have a strong structural connectivity and functional coupling pattern, i.e.,
6 rsFC, with either the human or macaque seeds (see detailed criterion in [Supplemental](#)
7 [section 5](#)) and 2) have substantial evidence-based homologs in this area between the
8 two species. Additionally, the target group should be able to make a unique
9 connectivity characterization of these seeds, so as to distinguish the seeds from each
10 other and from the other neighboring brain regions.

11 For humans, the prefrontal areas 11, 11m, 13, 14m, 25, 32pl, and 47o extracted
12 from a tractography-defined brain atlas ([Neubert et al., 2015](#)) and the AMYG, HIPPO,
13 thalamus (THA), midbrain (MidB), pallidum (Pa), caudate nucleus (Ca), and putamen
14 (Pu) extracted from the Harvard-Oxford subcortical atlas ([Desikan et al., 2006](#)) were
15 shown to have strong structural and functional connectivities with the shell-like and
16 core-like regions ([Xia et al., 2017](#)). For macaques, 8 prefrontal areas, 10m, 11m, 13a,
17 14m, 14o, 25, 32, and periallocortex, and 7 subcortical structures, the AMYG, HIPPO,
18 THA, MidB, Pa, Ca, and Pu, were extracted from a histological atlas ([Calabrese et al.,](#)
19 [2015; Paxinos et al., 2009](#)). (Note that small subdivisions in this atlas were combined
20 into their parent structure to approximately match the accuracy of the above human
21 atlas.) These prefrontal and subcortical areas were previously shown to have strong

1 structural and functional connectivities with the shell-like and core-like regions (Xia
2 et al., 2019a). In this study, we considered these prefrontal areas and subcortical
3 structures separately as candidates for targets to construct the fingerprint frameworks.
4 In addition, we repeated the above procedure using the histologically-defined
5 macaque shell and core (Paxinos et al., 2009; Calabrese et al., 2015) and validated the
6 reproducibility of the pre-selection of these targets (Fig. 1b). Then, we roughly
7 matched these human and macaque target regions based on macroscopic
8 morphological landmarks and added non-matching targets (i.e., corresponding areas
9 selected in only one species) to achieve the first criterion. Next, because some brain
10 areas may have no clear homolog between the two species (Bush and Allman, 2004),
11 we searched earlier studies to determine whether evidence-based non-homologous
12 areas and considerable interspecies differences exist for each pair of targets. If so, the
13 target was eliminated from the group to meet the second criterion.

14 Because projections from the ventromedial PFC are not limited to the Acb but
15 project broadly in the rostral striatum terminating throughout the medial Ca and Pu
16 (Ragsdale, 1981; Berendse et al., 1992; Haber et al., 1995; Ferry et al., 2000; Haber et
17 al., 2006; Averbek et al., 2014), we made additional experiments to discover whether
18 both the shell and the core could be distinguished from the rest of the striatum using
19 their structural connectivity profiles characterized by the prefrontal areas as well as by
20 whole-brain voxels (Supplemental section 6). If they did, we could use the prefrontal
21 areas to make unique structural connectivity characterizations of the shell and of the
22 core to perform reasonable cross-species comparisons.

1 **Delineating ICC Targets in the PFC**

2 The targets identified above for the two species were extracted from different types of
 3 brain atlases and could only be roughly matched across the species based on their
 4 general location. Specifically, the subcortical targets had relatively clear boundaries.
 5 They are undoubtedly pairs of homologs and thus could be used directly to establish
 6 the fingerprint-based common space for cross-species comparisons. In contrast, no
 7 macroscopic morphological landmarks supported such a clear-cut definition of the
 8 homologous target areas in the PFC. So, we did the next best thing: We redefined the
 9 boundaries of the pre-selected prefrontal targets based on the similarity of the rsFC
 10 profiles to ensure 1) they were connection units and 2) they were ICC brain regions.

11 [Neubert et al. \(2015\)](#) used 23 evidence-based homologous areas to calculate the
 12 rsFC fingerprint of voxels in the human and macaque PFC. Based on the similarity of
 13 the rsFC fingerprints between humans and macaques, the authors found pairs of ICC
 14 voxels dispersed in this cortical region, i.e., the rsFC profile was used to help relate
 15 the two primate brains. In this study, we delineated pairs of ICC targets in the PFC
 16 based on the similarity of the rsFC fingerprints calculated using the above 23
 17 homologs (see flow chart in Fig. [2](#)).

Figure 2. Delineating ICC targets in the PFC. Take area 25 for example: (A) The pre-selected human target of the area 25 extracted from the atlas provided by [Neubert et al. \(2015\)](#). (B) The calculated individual and group-level averaged similarity distribution maps (SDMs). (C) The delineated ICC target in humans (including 107 voxels). (D) A group of SDMs generated in the macaque brain and the group-averaged SDM. (E) The final delineated ICC target in the macaque brain (blue cluster). It is distinctly different from the pre-selected histologically-defined area 25 (red-tinged cluster).

We began the delineation of the ICC targets in the human population, as follows:

- 1) As suggested by [Neubert et al. \(2015\)](#), we drew 6 mm isotropic ROIs centered on the center-of-gravity of those pre-selected targets (e.g., area 25 shown in Fig. 2A). We brought these ROIs and the 23 homologous areas (6 mm isotropic) from the Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) space back into native space using the state-of-the-art ANTs' diffeomorphic transformation model ([Avants et al., 2008](#)). A limited number of the voxels that had been misregistered into the cerebrospinal fluid or white matter were moved to their actual locations. Then, we brought them from structural space back into functional space. For each ROI, in each subject's functional space, 2) we first calculated a series of functional couplings between this ROI and 23 homologous areas to build the rsFC fingerprint, which was considered as the eigen fingerprint.

1 Then, 3) we calculated the rsFC fingerprint for each voxel in the PFC using the 23
2 homologous areas. Finally, 4) we calculated the cosine similarity between each
3 voxel's fingerprint and the eigen fingerprint to generate a similarity distribution map
4 (SDM). Voxels in the SDM that are close to 1 reflect a strong possibility of being a
5 member of the connection unit. 5) We transformed all the individual SDMs into MNI
6 space to generate the group-averaged SDM (Fig. 2B), and thresholded it by extracting
7 the top 5% most similar voxels (discrete voxels were removed from the maximal
8 cluster) to obtain the final delineated ICC target in humans (Fig. 2C).

$$9 \quad \text{cosine similarity} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i \times q_i)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i)^2 \times \sum_{i=1}^n (q_i)^2}}$$

10 where, p and q are two vectors representing the functional connectivity fingerprints to
11 be compared; and n is the number of arms of the fingerprint.

12 Given a delineated ICC target in the human brain, we delineated the
13 corresponding ICC target in the macaque brain as follows: 6) We brought the 23
14 homologous areas (3 mm isotropic; cf. Neubert et al., 2015) from MNI monkey space
15 back into native space (24 macaques in MMDS2) like the first step. 7) For each
16 homologous area, in each subject's functional space, we first calculated the functional
17 couplings between this area and voxels in the PFC to generate the rsFC map. Then,
18 we transformed these rsFC maps into MNI monkey space to generate the
19 group-averaged rsFC map. The resulting 23 group-averaged rsFC maps were used to
20 extract the fingerprint for each voxel in the PFC in MNI monkey space. 8) For each

1 voxel in the given ICC target in the human brain, we first calculated its fingerprint
 2 and considered it as the eigen fingerprint. Then, we calculated the cosine similarities
 3 between this eigen fingerprint and the fingerprints of voxels in the macaque PFC to
 4 generate a corresponding SDM for the macaque brain. 9) We normalized these SDMs
 5 to their respective maximum and then averaged all the SDMs (e.g., 107 SDMs in Fig.
 6 2D). 10) We thresholded the group-averaged SDM by extracting the top 5% most
 7 similar voxels (discrete voxels were removed from the maximal cluster) to obtain the
 8 final ICC target in the macaque brain (Fig. 2E). Additionally, we adjusted the size of
 9 the 23 homologous areas (from 6 mm to 5 mm isotropic in the human brain and from
 10 3 mm to 2 mm isotropic in the macaque brain) to validate the reproducibility of the
 11 delineation of the ICC targets (Fig. 1c; Supplemental section 8).

12 **Cross-Species Comparisons**

13 To avoid being influenced by different brain sizes and voxel resolutions from the two
 14 species, earlier studies (Mars et al., 2013, 2016; Neubert et al., 2015) used relative
 15 connectivity values by normalizing the data to the maximal connectivity value in the
 16 brain to build fingerprints for cross-species comparison. However, since the relative
 17 connectivity value may be affected by different MRI acquisition parameters, different
 18 data processing procedures, and inconsistent normalization factors in different primate
 19 brains or even different individual brains within species, we used another connectivity
 20 feature, the structural connectivity ratio, to build structural connectivity fingerprints to

- 1 detect specific structural connectivity differences in the Acb shell-core architecture
- 2 between the two species.

$$3 \quad \text{connectivity ratio} = \frac{\text{RCV}(\text{target}, \text{shell})}{\text{RCV}(\text{target}, \text{shell}) + \text{RCV}(\text{target}, \text{core})}$$

- 4 where, *target* is one of the newly delineated ICC targets; $\text{RCV}(\text{target}, \text{seed})$ indicates
- 5 the relative connectivity value between the *target* and the *seed* (e.g., the shell or core);
- 6 connectivity ratio thus reflects the degree to which connectivity is biased to the shell
- 7 or core. It has values in the interval [0, 1], with the high and low values indicating
- 8 whether the target tended to connect with the shell or the core, respectively.

9 Similar calculation steps and processing parameters were used to calculate the

10 structural connectivity fingerprints for the two species. More specifically, we brought

11 the two seeds (shell-like and core-like divisions), homologous subcortical targets, and

12 ICC prefrontal targets from MNI space into native space. In the individual diffusion

13 space, we implemented whole-brain tractography for each seed using FSL's

14 PROBTRACKX2 (50,000 samples; the probability counts were corrected by the

15 length of the pathway; [Tomassini et al., 2007](#)) and thresholded these path distribution

16 estimates at $p > .04\%$ (i.e., 20 out of 50,000 samples; [Fan et al., 2016](#)) to limit false

17 positive connections. Then, we calculated the tractographic connectivity probabilities

18 between each target and the two seeds to generate a structural connectivity ratio.

19 Finally, using structural connectivity ratios calculated separately for the prefrontal and

20 subcortical target groups, we calculated fingerprints to characterize the structural

21 connectivity profiles of the Acb shell-core architecture for each individual. In addition,

1 for display purposes, we generated group-averaged structural connectivity fingerprints
2 for the prefrontal and subcortical target groups for the two species.

3 We used a permutation test to detect whether the structural connectivity profiles
4 of the Acb shell-core architecture are conserved between the two species by
5 evaluating the cosine similarity of their structural connectivity fingerprints. Our null
6 hypothesis assumed that the human and macaque Acb shell-core architecture have
7 conserved structural connectivity profiles. First, we generated the group-averaged
8 tractographic connectivity fingerprints of the human and macaque shell-core
9 architecture and defined their cosine similarity as the observation. Then, we
10 performed the following procedure 1000 times to create the permutation distribution:
11 1) Two groups of fingerprints were merged and then randomly divided into two
12 groups by keeping their sample sizes static (40 and 8). 2) We generated the
13 group-averaged fingerprints and calculated their cosine similarity. If the null
14 hypothesis was true, the two groups of fingerprints would have identical distributions
15 and the observed cosine similarity would not be rare in the permutation distribution
16 (the test criterion was set at 5%). Thus, we believed there would be no significant
17 interspecies difference between the two groups (humans and macaques) of
18 tractographic connectivity fingerprints. Additionally, a failure to show conservative
19 tractographic connectivity fingerprints could have been caused by one or more
20 significant species differences in a single structural connectivity. Any significant
21 single tractographic connectivity difference between the two species was determined
22 using an independent two-sample t test at the 5% significance level.

1 Results

2 Tractography-Defined Seeds

3 Both the high-resolution *ex vivo* (Fig. 3A) and low-resolution *in vivo* (Fig. 3B)
4 macaque MRI datasets showed that the Acb can be subdivided into ventromedial and
5 dorsolateral regions based on whole-brain voxel-wise tractography (Xia et al., 2019b).
6 They were named the shell-like and core-like divisions for their corresponding
7 relationships with the well-documented ventromedial shell and dorsolateral core (Fig.
8 3C). As expected, the parcellation results from the high-resolution MMDS1 group
9 described the data better than those from the low-resolution MMDS2 group
10 (Supplemental section 4), and thus the former were used as the final macaque seeds
11 for subsequent analyses. Similar to the previous parcellation results of the
12 microanatomically defined Acb region (Baliki et al., 2013; Xia et al., 2017; Zhao et
13 al., 2018) and the macaque Acb parcels, the human Acb connection unit could also be
14 subdivided into the ventromedial shell-like and dorsolateral core-like regions based on
15 whole-brain voxel-wise tractography (Fig. 3D). The tractography-defined human and
16 macaque Acb shell-core architecture have similar topological distribution and were
17 considered to be the best brain nodes for subsequent structural connectivity analyses.

Figure 3. Tractography-defined seeds. (A) The macaque Acb connection unit was parcellated based on whole-brain voxel-wise tractography using the high-resolution *ex vivo* MMDS1 to define the macaque seeds, i.e., the shell-like and core-like divisions. (B) The dichotomous Acb parcels generated by the low-resolution *in vivo* MMDS2. This result ensured the reproducibility of the tractography-defined shell-like and core-like divisions. (C) The histologically defined macaque shell and core provided by Paxinos et al., 2009 and Calabrese et al., 2015. (D) The human Acb connection unit was parcellated based on whole-brain voxel-wise tractography to generate the human seeds, i.e., the shell-like and core-like divisions. Acronyms: left hemisphere, LH; right hemisphere, RH. All the coordinates are shown in MNI (humans) or MNI monkey (macaques) space.

Defined Fingerprint Framework

The prefrontal areas and subcortical structures enabled us to make unique structural connectivity characterizations of the shell and core (Supplemental section 6). Then, 7 human subcortical structures, the AMYG, HIPPO, THA, MidB, Ca, Pu, and Pa, were pre-selected as candidates for the subcortical target group to construct a fingerprint framework. Also, 7 human prefrontal areas, 11, 11m, 13, 14m, 25, 32pl, and 47o, extracted from the tractography-defined atlas (Neubert et al., 2015), were pre-selected as candidates for the prefrontal target group to construct another fingerprint

1 framework. After further investigation, we found that only the most medial part of
 2 area 11 (a strip region located in the medial orbital gyrus) had a strong connectivity
 3 with the human seeds. We divided this strip region into three and merged these
 4 divisions into the neighboring areas 11m, 14m, and 13. Area 47o, located in the
 5 posterior part of the lateral orbitofrontal cortex, was eliminated from the target group
 6 due to its considerable functional connectivity difference between the two species
 7 (Neubert et al., 2015). We confirmed this conclusion in a subsequent delineation of
 8 the ICC brain area in area 47o. In the end, we pre-selected 5 prefrontal and 7
 9 subcortical targets in the human brain that could be used to construct fingerprint
 10 frameworks. Similarly, using the same analyses for the macaque brain, 7 subcortical
 11 structures, the AMYG, HIPPO, THA, MidB, Ca, Pu, and Pa, and 8 prefrontal areas,
 12 10m, 11m, 13a, 14m, 14o, 25, 32, and periallocortex, extracted from the histological
 13 atlas, were pre-selected separately as candidates for the prefrontal and subcortical
 14 target groups to construct the fingerprint frameworks. In addition, we found that the
 15 same prefrontal and subcortical targets could be identified when the histologically
 16 defined macaque shell and core regions were used as seeds.

17 Coincidentally, but understandably, the pre-selected 7 human subcortical
 18 structures completely overlapped with the pre-selected 7 macaque subcortical
 19 structures, i.e., they were identified as being the homologs between the two species
 20 and thus could be used directly to construct the final fingerprint framework. On the
 21 other hand, the pre-selected human and macaque prefrontal target regions could only
 22 be roughly matched based on macroscopic morphological landmarks (Supplemental

1 them h11m, h13, h14m, h25, and h32 ('h' is short for 'homologous'). Taking **h25** as
 2 an example (see the blue cluster in Fig. 5), in each human subject's functional space, a
 3 SDM, summarizing the degree of correspondence between the rsFC patterns of each
 4 voxel in the human PFC and the central region of the area 25, was calculated and then
 5 transformed into MNI space. We calculated the group-averaged SDM and thresholded
 6 it to generate the area h25 in the human brain. Next, for each voxel in the human area
 7 h25, we calculated a corresponding SDM in the macaque PFC. Then, the
 8 group-averaged SDM was generated and thresholded, with the resulting macaque area
 9 h25 being located in histological area 25, with some extensions into the medial
 10 periallocortex. Finally, we validated the reproducibility of the delineation of the area
 11 h25 (Fig. S5).

12 Using this procedure, we delineated other pairs of ICC targets in the two primate
 13 brains (Figs. 5, S6, and S7; Supplemental section 8) as follows: the h11m located in
 14 the medial frontal pole, the h13 located in the posterior medial orbital gyrus, the h14m
 15 located in the middle part of the ventromedial PFC, the h25 located in the posterior
 16 part of the ventromedial PFC, and the h32 located in the perigenual anterior cingulate
 17 cortex. In addition, we retested the prior description of an interspecies considerable
 18 difference in the lateral orbitofrontal cortex by trying to delineate ICC targets using
 19 area 47o. No cluster existed in the macaque anterior lateral orbital gyrus after the
 20 group-averaged SDM was thresholded.

Figure 5. Delineated ICC targets in the PFC. For each hemisphere (A: LH; B: RH), we delineated 5 pairs of ICC targets, h11m, h13, h14m, h25, and h32, which are displayed in red, cyan, green, blue, and yellow, respectively, using the color ranges: $[t, 1]$, t is the threshold value shown next to the colorbar.

Conserved Subcortical Structures-Acb Structural Connectivity

Using the tractography-defined seeds (the shell-like and core-like divisions) and the pre-selected subcortical structures, we built the structural connectivity fingerprint for each individual in the two species and displayed their group-averaged fingerprints in Fig. 6 (top panel). Permutation tests indicated good consistency between the two groups of fingerprints for the two species, as can be seen from the observed cosine similarity, which was less than the calculated test criterion at the 5% significance level in the right tail of the histogram. More specifically, the tractography results indicated that the AMYG and HIPV clearly tended to connect with the shell-like region, a finding that was consistent with earlier imaging results in humans (Baliki et al., 2013; Xia et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2018) and with tracing findings that the hippocampal projections from the subiculum and CA1 regions were notably restricted to the shell via the fimbria-fornix fiber bundle (Friedman et al., 2002; Poletti and Creswell, 1977). We also found that the caudal basolateral and rostral basal

1 amygdaloid fibers projected throughout the ventral striatum, especially the medial
2 part of the striatum (Friedman et al., 2002; Russchen et al., 1985). Beyond that, we
3 found approximately equivalent structural connectivity ratios (to the shell-like and
4 core-like areas) in the human and macaque brains (see the grouped box charts in Fig.
5 6). In contrast, the THA, MidB, and Ca tended to connect with the core-like area, a
6 finding which agrees with earlier neuroimaging results in humans (Baliki et al., 2013;
7 Xia et al., 2017; Zhao et al., 2018) and with tracing reports that the shell is
8 distinguished from the core in that it receives the fewest projections from the ventral,
9 anterior, medial, and lateral THA (Gimenez-Amaya et al., 1995) and that the monkeys
10 projections from the Acb (mainly the core) to the substantia nigra in the MidB seem
11 to outnumber those (mainly from the shell) to the ventral tegmental area in the MidB
12 (Haber et al., 1990). We found these regions all had similar structural connectivity
13 ratios between the two primate brains as well.

14

15 **Figure 6.** Cross-species comparison of the subcortical structures-Acb structural connectivity. The
16 group-averaged human and macaque structural connectivity fingerprints are shown using radar maps.

1 The convergence between the two groups of fingerprints for the two species was tested using a
 2 permutation test, and the results are shown in the histogram. The single structural connectivity ratio
 3 was calculated for each subcortical target in the two species. An independent two-sample t test was
 4 used to determine whether the two population means were equal, and the result is shown in the grouped
 5 box chart. The results indicate that the observed cosine similarity between the two group-averaged
 6 fingerprints of the two species was less than the calculated test criterion in the right tail of the
 7 histogram, suggesting a similar distribution of the two groups of fingerprints. In addition, no
 8 statistically significant single structural connectivity ratio difference was found between the two
 9 species. Acronyms: putamen, Pu; caudate nucleus, Ca; pallidum, Pa; amygdala, AMYG; hippocampus,
 10 HIPP; thalamus, THA; midbrain, MidB; Humans, Hum; Macaques, Mac.

11 **Altered PFC-Acb Structural Connectivity**

12 Using these seeds and 5 delineated ICC prefrontal targets, we built additional pairs of
 13 structural connectivity fingerprints for each individual in the human and macaque
 14 groups and displayed the two group-averaged fingerprints in Fig. 7 (top panel). Unlike
 15 the above subcortical result, we found a rare cosine similarity in the permutation
 16 distribution, as can be seen in the right tail of the histogram. The observed cosine
 17 similarity was higher than the calculated test criterion at the 5% significance level.
 18 Therefore, we rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that the prefrontal areas of
 19 the two primate species evolved dissimilar gross structural connectivity trends to the
 20 shell-core architecture. This result seems to align with evidences for heterochronic
 21 developmental shifts in the human PFC and prefrontal white matter during primate
 22 evolution (Carlén, 2017; Smaers et al., 2017; Schoenemann et al., 2005; Somel et al.,

2011). We concluded that one or more prefrontal targets had noticeably different structural connectivity trends in the two species and that this could be further checked by performing single structural connectivity analyses.

For each delineated prefrontal target, we calculated the structural connectivity ratio between this region and the two seeds in each of the two species (Fig. 7). More specifically, area h25 had a stronger structural connectivity to the shell-like area than to the core-like (about 0.8 of the structural connectivity ratio) in both species, which was consistent with previous findings that the rodent infralimbic area (rodent homolog of the primate posterior ventromedial PFC) was the main origin of cortical projections to the Acb and was notably restricted to the medial shell (van Kuyck et al., 2007). Moreover, we found no interspecies differences in the connectivity ratio of the h25 (and the other two areas in the ventromedial PFC, the h14m and h11m) to the two Acb parcels between the two species, suggesting that during primate evolution connectional strengthening or weakening of these prefrontal pathways to the shell-core architecture occurred approximately proportionately in the two types of primate brains. In addition, previous tracing results indicated that the ventromedial PFC and lateral orbitofrontal cortex mainly targeted the shell and core, respectively (Ferry et al., 2000; Haber et al., 1995). We obtained a similar result from neuroimaging and also found that the prominent tractographic connectivity between the shell-like area and h25 extended into the neighboring h13 in humans but not in macaques. Similar to the findings of a previous study (Baliki et al., 2013), we found no preferred structural connectivity of h32 with the core-like areas in either of the two

species, which seems to contradict the tracing result (Basar et al., 2010; Salgado and Kaplitt, 2015). However, we did find that the relative connectivity values between the two Acb subregions and h32 and their connectivity ratio all appeared significantly stronger in macaques than in humans (for detailed comparison results using relative connectivity values, see Supplemental section 10).

Figure 7. Cross-species comparison of PFC-Acb structural connectivity. Please refer to Figure 6 for a detailed legend. The results indicate that the two groups of fingerprints could not be accepted as convergent fingerprints because the observed cosine similarity was higher than the calculated criterion in the right tail of the histogram. The gross structural connectivity ratio (i.e., fingerprint) differences between the two species were localized to h13 (LH: humans: 0.61 ± 0.20 > macaques: 0.40 ± 0.12 ; $p = 5.7e-03$. RH: humans: 0.74 ± 0.17 > macaques: 0.39 ± 0.10 ; $p = 1.65e-06$) and h32 (LH: humans: 0.82 ± 0.16 > macaques: 0.55 ± 0.08 ; $p = 3.62e-05$. RH: humans: 0.79 ± 0.16 > macaques: 0.60 ± 0.15 ; $p = 3.1e-03$). Both of these showed significantly different structural connectivity ratios (* $p < .05$).

1 Discussion

2 We generated spatially corresponding shell-like and core-like divisions as seeds and
3 delineated ICC targets in human and macaque brains to build structural connectivity
4 fingerprints for viable cross-species comparisons. We revealed that the prefrontal but
5 not the subcortical target group had dissimilar structural connectivity with the
6 shell-core architecture between the two species. We localized this overall difference
7 to specific prefrontal targets in single structural connectivity analyses and analyzed
8 their possible influence on functions.

9 Microstructural and molecular features (e.g., cyto- and myelo-architecture) may
10 determine the local processing capabilities of a brain region, whereas connectivity
11 governs the nature and flow of information ([Hilgetag and Grant, 2000](#); [Passingham et](#)
12 [al., 2002](#); [Johansen-Berg et al., 2004](#)). Many studies have thus suggested that function
13 may depend more on connectivity than on microstructural features ([Cloutman and](#)
14 [Lambon Ralph, 2012](#); [Knosche and Tittgemeyer, 2011](#)). In addition, although
15 tractography does not exactly reflect the measures that traditional tract tracing does
16 ([Borra and Luppino, 2018](#)), significant advances in our understanding of brain
17 anatomy have already been made by using this technology because of its ability to
18 show the brain connectivity ([Grandjean et al., 2017](#); see [Supplemental section 9](#) for a
19 simple comparison between the two technologies). Based on these, in this study, we
20 used tractographic connectivity characteristics to characterize and compare the
21 shell-core architecture between humans and macaques to supplement previous

1 comparative findings, such as similarities in the cellular and molecular composition
2 and distribution in the shell and core between the species ([Volkow and Morales, 2015](#);
3 [Graybiel and Ragsdale, 1978](#); [Meredith et al., 1996](#)).

4 Fingerprint-based common space approaches fully exploit the possibilities
5 offered by neuroimaging techniques and have been used in recent comparative MRI
6 studies ([Mars et al., 2016, 2018a](#); [Neubert et al., 2015](#)). In this study, some measures
7 were used to enhance the reasonability of the common space approaches. First, a
8 series of connection units, including tractography-defined seeds and rsFC-defined
9 ICC targets, were generated to support the subsequent connectivity analyses. Second,
10 to understand whether the connections between homologous brain regions have
11 changed, it helps to be able to overlay homologous brain regions of the species of
12 interest and then compare their connectivity matrices ([Thiebaut de Schotten et al.,](#)
13 [2018](#)). In view of this, we identified the homologous relationships of the pre-selected
14 subcortical targets in the two species and redefined the boundaries of pre-selected
15 prefrontal targets to make sure they were ICC regions. In addition, we validated the
16 reproducibility of the definition of the seeds, pre-selected the targets, delineated the
17 ICC prefrontal targets, and characterized the structural connectivity of the shell-core
18 architecture ([Supplemental section 11](#)). The verification results indicated that there
19 was no serious snowballing effect resulting from the chain analysis used in this study.
20 In any case, all these measures enabled us to establish a viable comparative
21 framework while holding many other irrelevant factors constant so that we could
22 obtain credible comparison results.

1 Many evolutionarily conserved structural and functional features of the
2 subcortical structures, including the Acb, have been suggested (Izawa et al., 2003;
3 Calipari et al., 2012; Daniel and Pollmann, 2014; Balsters et al., 2019) and used as *a*
4 *priori* knowledge (Heilbronner et al., 2016; Neubert et al., 2015). But researchers
5 have also pointed out that many of their features had changed because of their
6 different evolutionary paths. For instance, the AMYG and HIPPO show
7 disproportionate volumetric growth and the striatum (which may influence the Acb)
8 shows shrinkage in the human brain compared with what would be predicted based on
9 primate scaling trends. Based on these findings, some researchers have suggested that
10 many of the functions of these homologous structures may not necessarily be
11 conserved (Barger et al., 2014; Stephan, 1983; Stephan et al., 1987). In this study, by
12 showing that the fingerprints had a strong cosine similarity, we revealed that the
13 structural connectivity profiles of the shell-core architecture characterized by the
14 subcortical substructures appears to be practically unaffected by their disproportionate
15 volumetric changes. This interspecies similar white matter layout is consistent with
16 many single conserved projections that have been suggested by tracing studies
17 (Friedman et al., 2002; Leong et al., 2016). These include the amygdaloid and
18 hippocampal projections to the Acb and the spiral-like organization of the
19 striato-mesencephalic-striatal projections. Our result suggests that any subtle
20 structural connectivity variations in these single connectivities between the two
21 species have not shifted the overall structural connectivity profiles of the shell-core
22 architecture.

1 Heterochronic genetic and developmental shifts of the human PFC regions
2 ([Somel et al., 2011](#); [Smaers et al., 2017](#)) have also brought macro-evolutionary scale
3 volumetric changes to these regions, e.g., the disproportionate volumetric growth of
4 the prefrontal gray and white matter areas ([Schoenemann et al., 2005](#); [Smaers et al.,](#)
5 [2017](#); [Carlén, 2017](#)) and their structural connectivity differences with the shell-core
6 architecture revealed in this study. Also, these structural connectivity differences may
7 be accompanied by some functional modifications, which we inferred and
8 summarized as follows: 1) Area h13 has been indicated as related to identifying
9 reward outcomes in humans ([Klein-Flügge et al., 2013](#)) and to encoding the
10 context-invariant value of goods in monkeys ([Padoa-Schioppa and Assad, 2008](#)).
11 These distinct functions may be respectively supported by their distinctive preferred
12 structural connectivity with the human shell-like and the macaque core-like regions. 2)
13 Area h32 has been implicated as involved with working memory for
14 action-outcome-based sequencing ([Coutureau and Killcross, 2003](#)). In addition, the
15 projection from this area to the striatal (mainly in the core) patch pathway has been
16 identified as causally required for decision-making in conflict situations ([Friedman et](#)
17 [al., 2015](#)). Significantly stronger structural connectivity in macaques than in humans
18 may suggest a greater ability of macaques to adjust or switch their reward-related
19 actions in conflict situations. In contrast, similar interspecies' single structural
20 connectivity of brain areas in the ventromedial PFC to the shell-core architecture may
21 suggest some conserved functions, such as the reward and decision-making process

1 related those neural projections (Floresco, 2015; Basar et al., 2010; Salgado and
2 Kaplitt, 2015).

3 In conclusion, we improved the fingerprint-based common space approaches by
4 providing a reasonable comparative framework. Using this approach, we revealed
5 conserved structural connectivity profiles of the Acb shell-core architecture with
6 subcortical structures but dissimilar structural connectivity profiles with prefrontal
7 regions. These results are in keeping with the well-accepted conclusion that the
8 human PFC has undergone considerable expansion and become more developed than
9 that of other primates. However, all these conserved and changed structural
10 connectivities only reflect general neuroanatomical evolutionary trends. Whether or
11 not any task-specific-related function of the Acb subregions has been affected will, of
12 course, be partially dictated by which connections are involved and how the signals
13 are integrated and interact via these connections.

1 **Funding**

2 This work was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos.
3 91432302, 31620103905, 81501179, and 61976150), the Science Frontier Program of
4 the Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant No. QYZDJ-SSW-SMC019), National Key
5 R&D Program of China (Grant No. 2017YFA0105203), Beijing Municipal Science &
6 Technology Commission (Grant Nos. Z161100000216152, Z161100000216139, and
7 Z181100001518004), Beijing Advanced Discipline Fund, and the Natural Science
8 Foundation of Shanxi Province of China (Grant No. 201801D121135). Human MRI
9 data were provided by the Human Connectome Project, WU-Minn Consortium
10 (Principal Investigators: David Van Essen and Kamil Ugurbil; 1U54MH091657)
11 funded by the 16 NIH Institutes and Centers that support the NIH Blueprint for
12 Neuroscience Research.

13 **Notes**

14 We thank Shan Yu and George Paxinos for their insightful discussions and useful
15 suggestions. We also thank Rhoda E. and Edmund F. Perozzi for editing assistance.
16 *Conflict of Interest:* None declared. Results are available for download from Gitlab at
17 <https://gitlab.com/xlxia/cross-species-comparison-of-the-Acb>.

18

1 **References**

- 2 Avants BB, Epstein CL, Grossman M, Gee JC. 2008. Symmetric diffeomorphic image
3 registration with cross-correlation: evaluating automated labeling of elderly and
4 neurodegenerative brain. *Med Image Anal.* 12:26-41.
- 5 Averbeck BB, Lehman J, Jacobson M, Haber SN. 2014. Estimates of projection overlap and
6 zones of convergence within frontal-striatal circuits. *J Neurosci.* 34:9497-9505.
- 7 Baliki MN, Mansour A, Baria AT, Huang L, Berger SE, Fields HL, Apkarian AV. 2013.
8 Parceling human accumbens into putative core and shell dissociates encoding of values
9 for reward and pain. *J Neurosci.* 33:16383-16393.
- 10 Balsters JH, Zerbi V, Sallet J, Wenderoth N, Mars RB. 2019. Primate homologs of mouse
11 cortico-striatal circuits. *BioRxiv.* 834481.
- 12 Barger N, Hanson KL, Teffer K, Schenker-Ahmed NM, Semendeferi K. 2014. Evidence for
13 evolutionary specialization in human limbic structures. *Front Hum Neurosci.* 8:e277.
- 14 Basar K, Sesia T, Groenewegen H, Steinbusch HW, Visser-Vandewalle V, Temel Y. 2010.
15 Nucleus accumbens and impulsivity. *Prog Neurobiol.* 92:533-557.
- 16 Berendse HW, Galis-de Graaf Y, Groenewegen HJ. 1992. Topographical organization and
17 relationship with ventral striatal compartments of prefrontal corticostriatal projections in
18 the rat. *J Comp Neurol.* 316:314-347.
- 19 Bjorklund A, Dunnett SB. 2007. Dopamine neuron systems in the brain: An update. *Trends*
20 *Neurosci.* 30:194-202.
- 21 Borra E, Luppino G. 2018. Large-scale temporo-parietofrontal networks for motor and
22 cognitive motor functions in the primate brain. *Cortex.* doi:
23 10.1016/j.cortex.2018.09.024.
- 24 Bush EC, Allman JM. 2004. The scaling of frontal cortex in primates and carnivores. *Proc*
25 *Natl Acad Sci USA.* 101:3962-3966.

- 1 Calabrese E, Badea A, Coe CL, Lubach GR, Shi Y, Styner MA, Johnson GA. 2015. A
2 diffusion tensor MRI atlas of the postmortem rhesus macaque brain. *Neuroimage*.
3 117:408-416.
- 4 Calipari ES, Huggins KN, Mathews TA, Jones SR. 2012. Conserved dorsal-ventral gradient
5 of dopamine release and uptake rate in mice, rats and rhesus macaques. *Neurochem Int*.
6 61:986-991.
- 7 Cardinal RN, Everitt BJ. 2004. Neural and psychological mechanisms underlying appetitive
8 learning: Links to drug addiction. *Curr Opin Neurobiol*. 14:156-162.
- 9 Carlén M. 2017. What constitutes the prefrontal cortex? *Science*. 358:478-482.
- 10 Cloutman LL, Lambon Ralph MA. 2012. Connectivity-based structural and functional
11 parcellation of the human cortex using diffusion imaging and tractography. *Front*
12 *Neuroanat*. 6:34.
- 13 Coutureau E, Killcross S. 2003. Inactivation of the infralimbic prefrontal cortex reinstates
14 goal-directed responding in overtrained rats. *Behav Brain Res*. 146:167-174.
- 15 Daniel R, Pollmann S. 2014. A universal role of the ventral striatum in reward-based learning:
16 evidence from human studies. *Neurobiol Learn Mem*. 114:90-100.
- 17 Desikan RS, Segonne F, Fischl B, Quinn BT, Dickerson BC, Blacker D, Buckner RL, Dale
18 AM, Maguire RP, Hyman BT, Albert MS, Killiany RJ. 2006. An automated labeling
19 system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions
20 of interest. *Neuroimage*. 31:968-980.
- 21 Donahue CJ, Sotiropoulos SN, Jbabdi S, Hernandez-Fernandez M, Behrens TE, Dyrby TB,
22 Coalson T, Kennedy H, Knoblauch K, Van Essen DC, Glasser MF. 2016. Using
23 Diffusion Tractography to Predict Cortical Connection Strength and Distance: A
24 Quantitative Comparison with Tracers in the Monkey. *J Neurosci*. 36:6758-6770.
- 25 Eickhoff SB, Thirion B, Varoquaux G, Bzdok D. 2015. Connectivity-based parcellation:
26 Critique and implications. *Hum Brain Mapp*. 36:4771-4792.

- 1 Eickhoff SB, Yeo BTT, Genon S. 2018. Imaging-based parcellations of the human brain. Nat
2 Rev Neurosci. 9:672-686.
- 3 Fan L, Li H, Zhuo J, Zhang Y, Wang J, Chen L, Yang Z, Chu C, Xie S, Laird AR, Fox PT,
4 Eickhoff SB, Yu C, Jiang T. 2016. The human brainnetome atlas: A new brain atlas based
5 on connectional architecture. Cereb Cortex. 26:3508-3526.
- 6 Ferry AT, Ongur D, An X, Price JL. 2000. Prefrontal Cortical Projections to the Striatum in
7 Macaque Monkeys: Evidence for an Organization Related to Prefrontal Networks. J
8 Comp Neurol. 425:447-470.
- 9 Floresco SB. 2015. The nucleus accumbens: An interface between cognition, emotion, and
10 action. Annu Rev Psychol. 66:25-52.
- 11 Folloni D, Sallet J, Khrapichev AA, Sibson NR, Verhagen L, Mars RB. 2019. Two fiber
12 pathways connecting amygdala and prefrontal cortex in humans and monkeys. bioRxiv.
13 561811.
- 14 Friedman A, Homma D, Gibb LG, Amemori K, Rubin SJ, Hood AS, Riad MH, Graybiel AM.
15 2015. A Corticostriatal Path Targeting Striosomes Controls Decision-Making under
16 Conflict. Cell. 161:1320-1333.
- 17 Friedman DP, Aggleton JP, Saunders RC. 2002. Comparison of hippocampal, amygdala, and
18 perirhinal projections to the nucleus accumbens: Combined anterograde and retrograde
19 tracing study in the Macaque brain. J Comp Neurol. 450:345-365.
- 20 Gimenez-Amaya JM, McFarland NR, De Las Heras S, Haber SN. 1995. Organization of
21 thalamic projections to the ventral striatum in the primate. J Comp Neurol. 354:127-149.
- 22 Grandjean J, Zerbi V, Balsters J, Wenderoth N, Rudin M. 2017. Structural basis of large-scale
23 functional connectivity in the mouse. J Neurosci. 37:8092-8101.
- 24 Graybiel AM, Ragsdale CWJr. 1978. Histochemically distinct compartments in the striatum
25 of human, monkeys, and cat demonstrated by acetylthiocholinesterase staining. Proc Natl
26 Acad Sci USA. 75:5723-5726.

- 1 Groenewegen HJ, der Vermeulen-Van ZE, te KA, Witter MP. 1987. Organization of the
2 projections from the subiculum to the ventral striatum in the rat. A study using
3 anterograde transport of Phaseolus vulgaris leucoagglutinin. *Neuroscience*. 23:103-120.
- 4 Haber SN, Kim KS, Maily P, Calzavara R. 2006. Reward-related cortical inputs define a
5 large striatal region in primates that interface with associative cortical connections,
6 providing a substrate for incentive-based learning. *J Neurosci*. 26:8368-8376.
- 7 Haber SN, Kunishio K, Mizobuchi M, Lynd-Balta E. 1995. The orbital and medial prefrontal
8 circuit through the primate basal ganglia. *J Neurosci*. 15:4851-4867.
- 9 Haber SN, Lynd E, Klein C, Groenewegen HJ. 1990. Topographic organization of the ventral
10 striatal efferent projections in the rhesus monkey: an anterograde tracing study. *J Comp*
11 *Neurol*. 293:282-298.
- 12 Hecht EE, Gutman DA, Bradley BA, Preuss TM, Stout D. 2015. Virtual dissection and
13 comparative connectivity of the superior longitudinal fasciculus in chimpanzees and
14 humans. *Neuroimage*. 108:124-137.
- 15 Heidbreder CA, Groenewegen HJ. 2003. The medial prefrontal cortex in the rat: Evidence for
16 a dorso-ventral distinction based upon functional and anatomical characteristics.
17 *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 27:555-579.
- 18 Heilbronner SR, Rodriguez-Romaguera J, Quirk GJ, Groenewegen HJ, Haber SN. 2016.
19 Circuit-based corticostriatal homologies between rat and primate. *Biol Psychiatry*.
20 80:509-521.
- 21 Hilgetag CC, Grant S. 2000. Uniformity, specificity and variability of corticocortical
22 connectivity. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 355:7-20.
- 23 Izawa E, Zachar G, Yanagihara S, Matsushima T. 2003. Localized lesion of caudal part of
24 lobus parolfactorius caused impulsive choice in the domestic chick: evolutionarily
25 conserved function of ventral striatum. *J Neurosci*. 23:1894-1902.
- 26 Jbabdi S, Lehman JF, Haber SN, Behrens TE. 2013. Human and Monkey Ventral Prefrontal

- 1 Fibers Use the Same Organizational Principles to Reach Their Targets-Tracing versus
- 2 Tractography. *J Neurosci.* 33:3190-3201.
- 3 Jbabdi S, Sotiropoulos SN, Haber SN, Van Essen DC, Behrens TE. 2015. Measuring
- 4 macroscopic brain connections in vivo. *Nat Neurosci.* 18:1546-1555.
- 5 Johansen-Berg H, Behrens TE, Robson MD, Drobnjak I, Rushworth MF, Brady JM, Smith
- 6 SM, Higham DJ, Matthews PM. 2004. Changes in connectivity profiles define
- 7 functionally distinct regions in human medial frontal cortex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.*
- 8 101:13335-13340.
- 9 Klein-Flügge MC, Barron HC, Brodersen KH, Dolan RJ, Behrens TE. 2013. Segregated
- 10 encoding of reward-identity and stimulus-reward associations in human orbitofrontal
- 11 cortex. *J Neurosci.* 33:3202-3211.
- 12 Knosche TR, Tittgemeyer M. 2011. The role of long-range connectivity for the
- 13 characterization of the functional-anatomical organization of the cortex. *Front Syst*
- 14 *Neurosci.* 5:58.
- 15 Leong JK, Pestilli F, Wu CC, Samanez-Larkin GR, Knutson B. 2016. White-Matter Tract
- 16 Connecting Anterior Insula to Nucleus Accumbens Correlates with Reduced Preference
- 17 for Positively Skewed Gambles. *Neuron.* 89:63-69.
- 18 Li H, Fan L, Zhuo J, Wang J, Zhang Y, Yang Z, Jiang T. 2017. ATPP: A Pipeline for
- 19 Automatic Tractography-Based Brain Parcellation. *Front Neuroinform.* 11:35.
- 20 Mars RB, Neubert FX, Verhagen L, Sallet J, Miller KL, Dunbar RI, Barton RA. 2014. Barton
- 21 Primate comparative neuroscience using magnetic resonance imaging: promises and
- 22 challenges. *Front Neurosci.* 8:298.
- 23 Mars RB, Passingham RE, Jbabdi S. 2018a. Connectivity Fingerprints: From Areal
- 24 Descriptions to Abstract Spaces. *Trends Cogn Sci.* 22:1026-1037.
- 25 Mars RB, Sallet J, Neubert F-X, Rushworth MF. 2013. Connectivity profiles reveal the
- 26 relationship between brain areas for social cognition in human and monkey

- 1 temporoparietal cortex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 110:10806-10811.
- 2 Mars RB, Sotiropoulos SN, Passingham RE, Sallet J, Verhagen L, Khrapitchev AA, Sibson N,
- 3 Jbabdi S. 2018b. Whole brain comparative anatomy using connectivity blueprints. *Elife*.
- 4 pii: e35237.
- 5 Mars RB, Verhagen L, Gladwin TE, Neubert FX, Sallet J, Rushworth MF. 2016. Comparing
- 6 brains by matching connectivity profiles. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev*. 60:90-97.
- 7 Meredith GE, Pattiselanno A, Groenewegen HJ, Haber SN. 1996. Shell and core in monkey
- 8 and human nucleus accumbens identified with antibodies to calbindin-D28k. *J Comp*
- 9 *Neurol*. 365:628-639.
- 10 Neubert F, Mars RB, Sallet J, Rushworth MFS. 2015. Connectivity reveals relationship of
- 11 brain areas for reward-guided learning and decision making in human and monkey
- 12 frontal cortex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 112:2695-2704.
- 13 Padoa-Schioppa C, Assad JA. 2008. The representation of economic value in the orbitofrontal
- 14 cortex is invariant for changes of menu. *Nat Neurosci*. 11:95-102.
- 15 Parkinson JA, Willoughby PJ, Robbins TW, Everitt BJ. 2000. Disconnection of the anterior
- 16 cingulate cortex and nucleus accumbens core impairs Pavlovian approach behavior:
- 17 Further evidence for limbic cortical-ventral striatopallidal systems. *Behav Neurosci*.
- 18 114:42-63.
- 19 Passingham RE, Stephan KE, Kotter R. 2002. The anatomical basis of functional localization
- 20 in the cortex. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 3:606-616.
- 21 Paxinos G, Huang X-F, Toga AW. 2009. *The Rhesus Monkey Brain in Stereotaxic*
- 22 *Coordinates*. 2nd ed. Academic Press, San Diego.
- 23 Poletti CE, Creswell G. 1977. Fornix system efferent projections in the squirrel monkey: an
- 24 experimental degeneration study. *J Comp Neurol*. 175:101-128.
- 25 Ragsdale CW Jr, Graybiel AM. 1981. The fronto-striatal projection in the cat and monkey and
- 26 its relationship to inhomogeneities established by acetylcholinesterase histochemistry.

- 1 Brain Res. 208:259-266.
- 2 Rigoard P, Buffenoir K, Jaafari N, Giot JP, Houeto JL, Mertens P, Velut S, Bataille B. 2011.
- 3 The accumbens frontal fasciculus in the human brain: a microsurgical anatomical study.
- 4 Neurosurgery. 68:1102-1111.
- 5 Rilling JK, Glasser MF, Jbabdi S, Andersson J, Preuss TM. 2011. Continuity, divergence, and
- 6 the evolution of brain language pathways. Front Evol Neurosci. 3:11.
- 7 Russchen FT, Bakst I, Amaral DG, Price J. 1985. The Amygdalostriatal Projections in the
- 8 Monkey. An Anterograde Tracing Study. Brain Res. 329:241-257.
- 9 Salgado S, Kaplitt MG. 2015. The nucleus accumbens: A comprehensive review. Stereotact
- 10 Funct Neurosurg. 93:75-93.
- 11 Schoenemann PT, Sheehan MJ, Glotzer LD. 2005. Prefrontal white matter volume is
- 12 disproportionately larger in humans than in other primates. Nat Neurosci. 8:242-252.
- 13 Smaers JB, Gómez-Robles A, Parks AN, Sherwood CC. 2017. Exceptional Evolutionary
- 14 Expansion of Prefrontal Cortex in Great Apes and Humans. Curr Biol. 27:714-720.
- 15 Somel M, Liu X, Tang L, Yan Z, Hu H, Guo S, Jiang X, Zhang X, Xu G, Xie G, Li N, Hu Y,
- 16 Chen W, Pääbo S, Khaitovich P. 2011. MicroRNA-driven developmental remodeling in
- 17 the brain distinguishes humans from other primates. PLoS Biol. 9:e1001214.
- 18 Sousa AMM, Zhu Y, Raghanti MA, Kitchen RR, Onorati M, Tebbenkamp ATN, Stutz B,
- 19 Meyer KA, Li M, Kawasawa YI, Liu F, Perez RG, Mele M, Carvalho T, Skarica M,
- 20 Gulden FO, Pletikos M, Shibata A, Stephenson AR, Edler MK, Ely JJ, Elsworth JD,
- 21 Horvath TL, Hof PR, Hyde TM, Kleinman JE, Weinberger DR, Reimers M, Lifton RP,
- 22 Mane SM, Noonan JP, State MW, Lein ES, Knowles JA, Marques-Bonet T, Sherwood
- 23 CC, Gerstein MB, Sestan N. 2017. Molecular and cellular reorganization of neural
- 24 circuits in the human lineage. Science. 358:1027-1032.
- 25 Stephan H. 1983. Evolutionary trends in limbic structures. Neurosci Biobehav Rev.
- 26 7:367-374.

- 1 Stephan H, Frahm HD, Baron G. 1987. Comparison of brain structure volumes in Insectivora
2 and primates. VII. Amygdaloid components. *J Hirnforsch.* 28:571-584.
- 3 Stopper CM, Floresco SB. 2011. Contributions of the nucleus accumbens and its subregions to
4 different aspects of risk-based decision making. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci.* 11:97-112.
- 5 Thiebaut de Schotten M, Croxson PL, Mars RB. 2018. Large-scale comparative neuroimaging:
6 Where are we and what do we need? *Cortex.* pii: S0010-9452(18)30407-6.
- 7 Tomassini V, Jbabdi S, Klein JC, Behrens TEJ, Pozzilli C, Matthews PM, Rushworth MF,
8 Johansen-Berg H. 2007. Diffusion-weighted imaging tractography-based parcellation of
9 the human lateral premotor cortex identifies dorsal and ventral subregions with
10 anatomical and functional specializations. *J Neurosci.* 27:10259-10269.
- 11 Van Essen DC, Smith SM, Barch DM, Behrens TE, Yacoub E, Ugurbil K. 2013. The
12 WU-Minn Human Connectome Project: An overview. *Neuroimage.* 80:62-79.
- 13 van Kuyck K, Casteels C, Vermaelen P, Bormans G, Nuttin B, Van Laere K. 2007. Motor- and
14 food-related metabolic cerebral changes in the activity-based rat model for anorexia
15 nervosa: a voxel-based microPET study. *Neuroimage.* 35:214-221.
- 16 Volkow ND, Morales M. 2015. The Brain on Drugs: From Reward to Addiction. *Cell.*
17 162:712-725.
- 18 Wang J, Zuo Z, Xie S, Miao Y, Ma Y, Zhao X, Jiang T. 2017. Parcellation of Macaque Cortex
19 with Anatomical Connectivity Profiles. *Brain Topogr.* 31:161-173.
- 20 Wedeen VJ, Rosene DL, Wang R, Dai G, Mortazavi F, Hagmann P, Kaas JH, Tseng WY. 2012.
21 The geometric structure of the brain fiber pathways. *Science.* 335:1628-1634.
- 22 Wright CI, Groenewegen HJ. 1996. Patterns of overlap and segregation between insular
23 cortical, intermediodorsal thalamic and basal amygdaloid afferents in the nucleus
24 accumbens of the rat. *Neuroscience.* 73:359-373.
- 25 Xia X, Fan L, Cheng C, Eickhoff SB, Chen J, Li H, Jiang T. 2017. Multimodal
26 connectivity-based parcellation reveals a shell-core dichotomy of the human nucleus

- 1 accumbens. Hum Brain Mapp. 38:3878-3898.
- 2 Xia X, Fan L, Cheng C, Yao R, Deng H, Zhao D, Li H, Jiang T. 2019a. Interspecies
- 3 Differences in the Connectivity of Ventral Striatal Components between Humans and
- 4 Macaques. Front Neurosci. 13:623.
- 5 Xia X, Fan L, Hou B, Zhang B, Zhang D, Cheng C, Deng H, Dong Y, Zhao X, Li H, Jiang T.
- 6 2019b. Fine-Grained Parcellation of the Macaque Nucleus Accumbens by
- 7 High-Resolution Diffusion Tensor Tractography. Front Neurosci. 13:709.
- 8 Zhang D, Guo L, Zhu D, Li K, Li L, Chen H. 2013. Diffusion tensor imaging reveals
- 9 evolution of primate brain architectures. Brain Struct Funct. 218:1429-1450.
- 10 Zhao X, Yang R, Wang K, Zhang Z, Wang J, Tan X, Zhang J, Mei Y, Chan Q, Xu J, Feng Q,
- 11 Xu Y. 2018. Connectivity-based parcellation of the nucleus accumbens into core and
- 12 shell portions for stereotactic target localization and alterations in each NAc subdivision
- 13 in mTLE patients. Hum Brain Mapp. 39:1232-1245.