**Appendix A**

**Covariates**

**Psychopathology**. We administered the 112-item Youth Self Report (YSR; Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1989) to assess adolescents’ psychopathological symptoms. The internalizing and externalizing symptom scales were applied to characterize our sample. The total behavior problem score was employed to control for psychopathological symptoms in maltreatment and age analyses.

**Intelligence**. The working memory (digit span, arithmetic) and processing speed (symbol search, cancellation) subscales of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children – Fourth Edition (WISC-IV; Wechsler, 2003) or the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale – Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV; Wechsler, 2008) were employed to assess participants’ IQ (WISC-IV for ages 12-16 and WAIS-IV for age 17, respectively). A composite score was computed using the mean of the two subscale IQ scores of the respective test.

**Fetal alcohol syndrome**. To rule out any effect of fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS) on brain function and structure, we screened all participants for the FAS facial phenotype using the FAS Facial Photographic Analysis Software, Version 2.1.0 (Astley, 2016). Based on three photos of each participant, FAS features were coded on the 4-Digit Diagnostic Code for facial phenotype rank as being absent, mild, moderate or severe (1 to 4; Astley & Clarren, 2000). In a foster care population, the performance of the FAS facial photographic screening tool was highly accurate (Astley, Stachowiak, Clarren, & Clausen, 2002). However, only severe FAS features (rank 4) have been associated with a sufficiently positive predictive value and specificity to diagnose FAS if maternal alcohol exposure during pregnancy is unknown (Astley Hemingway, 2020).

**Puberty status**. We assessed participants’ puberty status using the Tanner Scales (Marshall & Tanner, 1969, 1970). This picture-based, sex-specific questionnaire is composed of three questions regarding onset and current status of physical development of external primary (breast/scrotum) and secondary (pubic hair) sex characteristics (five-point scale from 0 to 4 indicating the stage of development). Responses to questions about current status (1) of primary sex characteristics and (2) of secondary sex characteristics were averaged.

**Socioeconomic status**. Socioeconomic status (SES) was operationalized via educational status of the mother (or other primary caregiver), as indexed by the mother’s highest school qualification.

**Procedure**

The study took place across two sessions of about 3-hours each with trained testing staff. During the first appointment at the …………………………………………………….., adolescents participated in the WISC-IV or WAIS-IV assessment and the photo session for FAS evaluation. Separately, we conducted the Maternal Maltreatment Classification Interview (MMCI; Cicchetti, Toth, & Manly, 2003) with the caregiver, who also completed several questionnaires. Finally, adolescents undertook a 20-minute mock scanning session at the ………………….............. in preparation for the actual MRI scan to minimize motion artefacts related to nervousness and anxiety. For the mock scanning session, participants were first familiarized with the scanning procedure (i.e., explaining why to remove any metal items, showing them all devices, telling them about the different scanner noises, as well as the importance of remaining as still as possible during scanning). In the mock scanner, participants watched a 10-minute animal documentary while receiving behavioral feedback regarding their head motion (measured with a motion sensor attached to their forehead) throughout the movie (i.e., the movie briefly froze when participants moved to provide feedback). This procedure not only ensured that participants remained as motionless as possible during the actual scan, but also served to screen out participants due to excessive movement (*n*=1) before the actual scan.

During the second appointment at the …………., adolescents were first instructed about the Cyberball paradigm outside the scanner. They subsequently played a short practice sequence in the scanner before functional MRI scans were obtained. Furthermore, we administered a structural scanning sequence between Cyberball and an additional reversal learning task not further considered here.[[1]](#footnote-1) Participants spent about 60 minutes in total in the scanner. After scanning, children completed questionnaires.

**Analyses of Age, Maltreatment, and Maltreatment X Age Effects**

**Analyses of sample characteristics**. Maltreated and nonmaltreated groups were compared on relevant sample characteristics across all participants as well as within the early and mid-adolescent groups using one-way ANOVAs, Mann-Whitney *U,* and Chi-squared (χ2) tests. Similarly, each exposure group (i.e., abused/neglected/emotionally maltreated) was compared to the nonmaltreated group to test whether matching was preserved for these subgroups. Additional one-way ANOVAs were conducted to test whether the early adolescent vs. mid-adolescent maltreated groups significantly differed in maltreatment characteristics.

Based on the results of the aforementioned between-group analyses of sample characteristics (see **Sample Characteristics** in **Appendix B**), all significant maltreatment and age analyses (described below) were conducted with and without two participants showing moderate FAS features to control for any influence of fetal alcohol exposure on our findings. We further controlled all significant effects for psychopathological symptoms by applying the YSR total behavior problem score in ANCOVAs or multiple regressions to account for differences in psychopathology between maltreated and nonmaltreated participants. In multiple regressions assessing effects of maltreatment dimensions, we also included age to control its potentially confounding effect. Finally, significant between-group analyses of maltreatment subtypes were controlled for differences in SES as matching regarding SES was not preserved for the comparison of these subgroups to the nonmaltreated controls.

**Analyses of categorical age and maltreatment variables**. Main effects of age and differential maltreatment exposures (i.e., abuse, neglect, and EM) as well as their interaction effects on activation differences in the whole-brain derived clusters were assessed using one-way and two-way ANOVAs, respectively.[[2]](#footnote-2) To this end, we first assessed the main effect of age across the full sample. In a second step, we tested main and interaction effects of age and each maltreatment exposure comparing participants with the respective exposure (*n*=19 physically/sexually abused; *n*=34 physically neglected; *n*=49 emotionally maltreated) to nonmaltreated controls (*n*=40). Analyses were controlled for multiple comparisons (i.e., the number of clusters per contrast). Thus, cut-off *p*-values were adjusted to *q*<.0167 for rejection > not-my-turn contrast, *q*<.0045 for rejection > acceptance contrast, as well as *q*<.0083 for the contrast acceptance > rejection. For the contrast not-my-turn > rejection the *p*<.05 cut-off was applied, as only activation differences from one cluster were tested. Following up significant interaction effects, we tested between-group effects for (a) maltreatment-exposed (i.e., abused, neglected, or emotionally maltreated) vs. nonmaltreated participants within the early vs. mid-adolescent groups, as well as (b) early vs. mid-adolescent groups within maltreatment-exposed vs. nonmaltreated participants using one-way ANOVAs. Finally, we conducted three-way ANOVAs separately within the two age bands to examine specific associations of the maltreatment subtypes abuse, neglect, as well as emotional maltreatment (present vs. absent) with activation differences across the whole sample.

To examine global maltreatment effects, we repeated the age x maltreatment analyses (including follow-up tests) without distinguishing between different maltreatment exposures. If the assumption of variance homogeneity was not met in any between-group analysis, we tested the respective effect using Welch's *F* test. If the residuals of any between-group analysis were not normally distributed, we tested the respective effect using the Mann-Whitney *U* test.

**Analyses of maltreatment dimensions.** We examined dose-dependent effects of dimensional maltreatment exposures (continuous aggregate scores using factor values from structural equation modeling) and activation differences within the respective whole-brain contrasts using multiple regressions. To correct for multiple comparisons, we applied the same corrected *p*-values as for the between-group analyses described in the previous section. In the first step, multiple regressions were conducted for each maltreatment exposure dimension (i.e., abuse, neglect, and emotional maltreatment) predicting activation differences for each cluster, separately within each of the exposure subgroups (either abused, neglected, or emotionally maltreated participants). Following up on significant effects of one exposure dimension, we included the respective other exposure dimensions in the model*.* For all significant regression analyses, if residuals were not normally distributed, bootstrapping was conducted (5000 bootstrapped samples drawn with replacement from the original dataset providing bias-corrected and accelerated (BCa) 95% CIs).

**Appendix B**

**Sample Characteristics**

In preliminary analyses, we examined whether maltreated and nonmaltreated participants significantly differed in important sample characteristics. In **Table B1**, we show that there were no significant between-group differences in age, gender, handedness, SES, IQ score, as well as puberty status (i.e., the mean Tanner score). However, on average, the maltreated group had a significantly higher FAS score. This difference was primarily attributable to two participants, both in the maltreated group, who scored a 3 on the FAS scale (1=absent, 2=mild, 3=moderate, and 4=severe). After excluding these two participants, FAS scores did not differ between groups any longer (*F*(1, 89.65)=2.38, *p*=.126). To rule out any influence of fetal alcohol exposure on our findings, all analyses yielding significant maltreatment (subtype), age and/or maltreatment (subtype) by age effects were repeated while excluding these two participants. As analyses yielded comparable effects, the final results reported in this manuscript are based on the full maltreated sample. As expected, the maltreated group displayed significantly more internalizing and externalizing symptoms in the YSR (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1989) than the nonmaltreated group (as noted above psychopathological symptoms were therefore controlled in an additional analytic step).

Focusing on the specific exposure subgroups, the abused, neglected, and emotionally maltreated groups did not differ significantly from the nonmaltreated group on age, gender, handedness, IQ score, as well as pubertal status (*p*s>.05). However, the SES score was significantly lower for the abused, neglected, and emotionally maltreated groups (*p*s<.05). Thus, we controlled for this covariate in all exposure-specific between-group analyses.

When examining sample characteristics for maltreated vs. nonmaltreated participants separately within early and mid-adolescent groups, more internalizing symptoms were only reported by maltreated vs. non-maltreated youth in the mid-adolescent group (*F*(1, 46)=4.11, *p*=.048), but not in the early adolescent group. Yet, we found no significant differences for any of the other sample characteristics (*p*s>.05). Early and mid-adolescent maltreated participants also did not differ in their maltreatment exposure (see **Table B2**).

Table B1

*Sample Characteristics of Maltreated and Nonmaltreated Adolescents*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Maltreated group(*n* = 58) | Nonmaltreatedgroup(*n* = 40) | Between-group comparison |
| **Sample characteristics** |  |  | **Test-statistic** | ***p*** |
| Mean participant age in years (*SD*)  | 14.88 (2.07) | 14.35 (1.82) | *F*(1, 90.41) = 1.79 | .184a |
| % females | 44.83 | 57.50 | χ2(1) = 1.52 | .218 |
| % left handedness | 12.50 | 10.35 | χ2(1) = 0.11 | .740 |
| Median maternal school education  | High school diploma | General qualification for university entrance | *U* = 937.50 | .078 |
| Mean IQ score (*SD*) | 97.21 (8.52) | 98.68 (7.50) | *F*(1, 96) = 0.77 | .381 |
| Mean Tanner score (*SD*) | 2.65 (0.94)b | 2.54 (0.91) | *F*(1, 95) = 0.32 | .575 |
| Mean FAS score (*SD*) | 1.43 (0.57) | 1.23 (0.42)c | *F*(1, 93.81) = 4.05 | .047a |
| Mean YSR internalizing symptoms (*SD*) | 13.85 (8.85) | 9.48 (7.88) | *F*(1, 96) = 6.30 | .014 |
| Mean YSR externalizing symptoms (*SD*) | 11.04 (6.49) | 7.68 (4.72) | *F*(1, 96) = 7.85 | .006 |

*Note.* FAS=Fetal Alcohol Syndrome; YSR=Youth Self Report.

a If the assumption of variance homogeneity was not met, Welch's *F* test was used to examine differences between groups. b *n* = 56. c *n* = 39.

Table B2

*Maltreatment Characteristics within the Maltreated Sample (n = 58) for Early vs. Mid- Adolescence*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Early adolescence (≤ 13.5 years; *n* = 28) | Mid- adolescence (> 13.5 years; *n* = 30) | Between-group comparison |
| **Maltreatment characteristics** | ***M (SD)*** | ***M (SD)*** | **Test-statistic** | ***p*** |
| Chronicity (% of affected developmental periods; 1-100%) | 59.76 (28.54) | 54.33 (29.31) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.51 | .478 |
| Maximum severity (1-5) | 2.89 (1.13) | 2.83 (1.29) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.04 | .853 |
| Number of subtypes (1-6) | 2.11 (1.33) | 1.90 (0.80) | *F*(1, 48.39) = 0.64 | .429a |
| Extent of abuse (factor value) | 0.05 (0.11) | 0.03 (0.10) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.70 | .406 |
| Abuse - chronicity (% of affected developmental periods; 0-100%) | 7.68 (10.69) | 4.28 (8.02) | *F*(1, 49.96) = 1.86 | .179a |
| Abuse - maximum severity (0-5) | 0.46 (0.69) | 0.40 (0.86) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.10 | .755 |
| Abuse - number of subtypes (0-2) | 0.43 (0.57) | 0.30 (0.53) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.78 | .380 |
| Extent of neglect (factor value) | 0.08 (0.13) | 0.08 (0.13) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.00 | .963 |
| Neglect - chronicity (% of affected developmental periods; 0-100%) | 13.90 (17.17) | 9.94 (12.93) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.99 | .324 |
| Neglect - maximum severity (0-5) | 1.39 (1.37) | 1.67 (1.71) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.45 | .505 |
| Neglect - number of subtypes (0-2) | 0.68 (0.61) | 0.70 (0.65) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.02 | .898 |
| Extent of EM (factor value) | 0.25 (0.20) | 0.22 (0.17) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.40 | .531 |
| EM - chronicity (% of affected developmental periods; 0-100%) | 32.86 (21.25) | 27.89 (23.56) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.71 | .404 |
| EM - maximum severity (0-5) | 2.46 (1.48) | 2.07 (1.36) | *F*(1, 56) = 1.14 | .291 |
| EM - number of subtypes (0-2) | 1.21 (0.74) | 1.23 (0.68) | *F*(1, 56) = 0.01 | .919 |

*Note.* EM=emotional maltreatment. a If the assumption of variance homogeneity was not met, Welch's *F* test was used to examine differences between groups.

Table B3

*Rejection versus Not-my-turn*

|  |
| --- |
| Rejection > Not-my-turn |
| **Anatomical region** | **Hemi-sphere** | **x, y, z** | ***t*** | ***z*** | ***k*** | ***p*** |
| Precuneus/posterior cingulate cortex | L | -8, -38, 40 | 5.76 | 5.33 | 37 | .001 |
| Superior temporal gyrus | L | -44, -32, 6 | 5.45 | 5.08 | 30 | .005 |
| Precuneus/posterior cingulate cortex | L | -10, -58, 8 | 5.04 | 4.74 | 21 | .021 |
| **Not-my-turn > Rejection** |
| **Anatomical region** | **Hemis-phere** | **x, y, z** | **t** | ***z*** | ***k*** | ***p*** |
| Premotor cortex/supplementary motor area | L | -26, -6, 64 | 6.41 | 5.84 | 206 | <.001 |
| Postcentral gyrus | L | -34, -36, 52 | 5.19 | 4.87 | 28 | .012 |

*Note.* Clusters listed are significant in a whole-brain analysis (*p* < 0.05 FWE-corrected at voxel level, *k* > 20 voxels). x, y, z refer to MNI coordinates. T refers to the t-score and z to the z-score at those coordinates (local maxima). K refers to the number of voxels in each significant cluster.



*Figure B1.* Rejection versus Not-my-turn. The figure displays a selection of significant clusters for the contrast rejection > not-my-turn (positive values; yellow to red) and not-my-turn > rejection (negative values; green to blue). For a complete list, please refer to **Table B3**. Shown clusters are significant in a whole-brain analysis (*p* < 0.05 FWE-corrected at the voxel level, *k* > 20 voxels). x, y, z refer to MNI coordinates. PRC/PCC=precuneus/posterior cingulate cortex; PMC/SMA=premotor cortex/supplementary motor area.

Table B4

*Rejection versus Acceptance*

|  |
| --- |
| Rejection > Acceptance |
| **Anatomical region** | **Hemi-sphere** | **x, y, z** | ***t*** | ***z*** | ***k*** | ***p*** |
| Primary visual cortex | R | 12, -90, -2 | 18.68 | Inf | 7422 | <.001 |
| Lingual gyrus | L | -12, -88, -8 | 15.43 | Inf |  | <.001 |
| Visual association area | R | 14, -80, 24 | 8.29 | 7.19 |  | <.001 |
| Extrastriate cortex | R | 16, -86, 32 | 8.1 | 7.06 |  | <.001 |
| Precuneus/posterior cingulate cortex (PRC/PCC) | L | -8, -54, 12 | 7.84 | 6.88 |  | <.001 |
| Visual association area | L | -8, -78, 22 | 7.66 | 6.76 |  | <.001 |
| Cuneus | R | 6, -90, 26 | 7.4 | 6.57 |  | <.001 |
| Extrastriate cortex | R | 6, -86, 34 | 7.16 | 6.4 |  | <.001 |
| Lingual gyrus | L | -18, -50, 12 | 6.77 | 6.11 |  | <.001 |
|  PRC/PCC | R | 12, -52, 14 | 6.7 | 6.06 |  | <.001 |
| PRC/PCC | L | -18, -68, 14 | 6.11 | 5.6 |  | <.001 |
| PRC/PCC | R | 24, -58, 12 | 5.92 | 5.46 |  | .001 |
| Cerebellum - Tuber | R | 38, -74, -32 | 5.75 | 5.32 |  | .002 |
| Cerebellum - Pyramis | R | 26, -70, -36 | 5.31 | 4.96 |  | .009 |
| Precentral gyrus | R | 38, -14, 40 | 9.33 | Inf | 1281 | <.001 |
| Precentral gyrus | L | 18, -26, 68 | 8.9 | 7.59 | 1699 | <.001 |
| Precentral gyrus | L | -40, -14, 38 | 8.69 | 7.46 | 706 | <.001 |
| PCC | L | -6, -38, 42 | 8.53 | 7.35 | 312 | <.001 |
| Inferior frontal gyrus | L | -54, 26, 22 | 8.27 | 7.18 | 1119 | <.001 |
| Superior temporal gyrus | L | -48, -34, 6 | 7.18 | 6.42 | 732 | <.001 |
| Orbitofrontal area | R | 36, 38, -12 | 6.36 | 5.8 | 86 | <.001 |
| Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (PFC) | R | 48, 30, 20 | 6.35 | 5.79 | 213 | <.001 |
| Superior temporal gyrus | L | -48, -16, -4 | 6.29 | 5.75 | 557 | <.001 |
| Parahippocampal gyrus | L | -28, -28, -20 | 6.14 | 5.63 | 113 | <.001 |
| Inferior parietal lobule | L | -44, -72, 38 | 6.13 | 5.62 | 215 | <.001 |
| Superior frontal gyrus | L | -24, 24, 52 | 5.55 | 5.16 | 55 | .004 |
| Hippocampus | R | 32, -34, 4 | 5.54 | 5.15 | 23 | .004 |
| Parahippocampal gyrus | L | -20, -42, -6 | 5.27 | 4.93 | 22 | .010 |
| Anterior insular cortex | R | 42, 8, -12 | 5.25 | 4.91 | 28 | .011 |
| Parahippocampal gyrus | R | 34, -40, -4 | 5.22 | 4.89 | 22 | .013 |
| Parahippocampal gyrus | L | -24, -18, -16 | 5.08 | 4.77 | 21 | .020 |
| **Acceptance > Rejection** |
| **Anatomical region** | **Hemi-sphere** | **x, y, z** | ***t*** | ***z*** | ***k*** | ***p*** |
| Dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC)/pre-supplementary motor area | L | -6, 4, 50 | 12.93 | Inf | 7797 | <.001 |
| Primary somatosensory cortex | L | -38, -26, 54 | 12.74 | Inf |  | <.001 |
| Premotor cortex/supplementary motor area | L | -30, -10, 60 | 12.34 | Inf |  | <.001 |
| Precentral gyrus | R | 32, -8, 56 | 8.28 | 7.19 |  | <.001 |
| Superior frontal gyrus | R | 12, 4, 62 | 8.15 | 7.1 |  | <.001 |
| DACC | R | 10, 22, 32 | 7.99 | 6.99 |  | <.001 |
| Paracentral lobule | L | -10, -22, 46 | 7.36 | 6.54 |  | <.001 |
| DACC | L | -10, 18, 32 | 7.24 | 6.46 |  | <.001 |
| Postcentral gyrus | L | -48, -22, 22 | 6.52 | 5.92 |  | <.001 |
| DACC | L | -8, 30, 28 | 6.48 | 5.89 |  | <.001 |
| Insula/putamen | L | -32, 16, 10 | 8.82 | 7.54 | 1035 | <.001 |
| Insula/putamen | R | 34, 20, 8 | 8.82 | 7.54 | 665 | <.001 |
| Cerebellum - Culmen | R | 24, -50, -22 | 8.44 | 7.29 | 251 | <.001 |
| Hypothalamus/thalamus | L | -10, -20, 0 | 7.81 | 6.86 | 496 | <.001 |
| Dorsolateral PFC | R | 30, 36, 30 | 6.79 | 6.12 | 393 | <.001 |
| Middle frontal gyrus/dorsolateral PFC | L | -32, 38, 32 | 6.64 | 6.02 | 156 | <.001 |
| PRC | L | -12, -64, 52 | 5.95 | 5.48 | 112 | .001 |
| Occipital lobe  | R | 2, -68, 4 | 5.86 | 5.41 | 37 | .001 |
| Primary somatosensory cortex | R | 54, -20, 44 | 5.69 | 5.27 | 100 | .002 |
| Cerebellum - Inferior Semi-Lunar Lobule | R | 16, -60, -50 | 5.59 | 5.19 | 30 | .003 |
| Postcentral gyrus | R | 32, -36, 46 | 5.44 | 5.07 | 46 | .006 |
| Inferior frontal gyrus | R | 58, 10, 20 | 5.41 | 5.04 | 25 | .006 |

*Note.* Clusters listed are significant in a whole-brain analysis (*p* < 0.05 FWE-corrected at voxel level, *k* > 20 voxels). x, y, z refer to MNI coordinates. T refers to the t-score and z to the z-score at those coordinates (local maxima). K refers to the number of voxels in each significant cluster.



*Figure B2.* Rejection versus Acceptance. The figure displays a selection of significant clusters for the contrast rejection > acceptance (positive values; yellow to red) and acceptance > rejection (negative values; green to blue). For a complete list, please refer to **Table B4**. Clusters are significant in a whole-brain analysis (*p* < 0.05 FWE-corrected at the voxel level, *k* > 20 voxels). x, y, z refer to MNI coordinates. dACC/pre-SMA=dorsal anterior cingulate cortex/pre-supplementary motor area; dlPFC=dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; IFG=inferior frontal gyrus; IN=insula; IPL=inferior parietal lobule; MFG=middle frontal gyrus; PCG=precentral gyrus; PHG=parahippocampal gyrus; PRC/PCC=precuneus/posterior cingulate cortex; PUT=putamen; S1=primary somatosensory cortex; SFG=superior frontal gyrus; THL/HYP=thalamus/hypothalamus; V1=primary visual cortex.

**Effects of Age, Maltreatment, and Maltreatment X Age**

**Main effect of maltreatment**. There were no significant main effects of maltreatment for any cluster (see **Table B5**). Significant main effects of age across the whole sample are reported in the paragraph on **Main effects of age and maltreatment subtypes** of the **Results** section.

**Interaction effect of age X maltreatment.** Within two clusters derived from the contrast acceptance > rejection, we found significant interaction effects of age by maltreatment, namely in a cluster with its main peak in the left dACC/pre-SMA and another cluster encompassing the left MFG/dlPFC (*p*s≤.003; see **Figure B3** and **Table B5**).[[3]](#footnote-3) Since the dACC/pre-SMA cluster comprised over 7000 voxels, we conducted further specification analyses within a sphere with radius 5mm around the main peak at [-6, 4, 50] and four theoretically important subpeaks (defined by the selection criteria described in the **Methods** section **Analyses of age, maltreatment, and maltreatment X age effects**): (a) the primary somatosensory cortex (peak voxel at [-38, -26, 54]), (b) premotor cortex/supplementary motor area (PMC/SMA; peak voxel at [-30, -10, 60]), (c) right dACC (peak voxel at [10, 22, 32]), and (d) paracentral lobule (peak voxel at [-10, -22, 46]). Interaction effects were significant (*q*<.01) for the main peak sphere (left dACC/pre-SMA; *F*(1, 94)=9.68 , *p*=.002, ηp2=.093) and two subpeak spheres, the left primary somatosensory cortex (*F*(1, 94)=7.42 , *p*=.008, ηp2=.073) and the right dACC (*F*(1, 94)=10.44 , *p*=.002, ηp2=.100). These interaction effects remained significant after controlling for psychopathological symptoms in the model (*p*s<.05). Descriptively, all significant interaction effects emerged due to a decrease in the activation difference for acceptance > rejection with increasing age for nonmaltreated adolescents, but an increase in this activation difference with increasing age for maltreated adolescents.

To further specify these age by maltreatment interactions, we tested the between-group effects for maltreated vs. nonmaltreated participants within early and mid-adolescence separately. In early adolescence, significant between-group effects emerged for the acceptance > rejection activation difference within the MFG/dlPFC cluster (*F*(1, 48)= 10.65 , *p*=.002, ηp2=.182), the right dACC sphere (*F*(1, 48)=9.18, *p*=.004, ηp2=.161), and the left dACC/pre-SMA sphere (*F*(1, 48)=5.04, *p*=.029, ηp2=.095). In all three regions, nonmaltreated adolescents showed a larger acceptance > rejection activation difference than maltreated adolescents. In the left dACC/pre-SMA sphere, the acceptance > rejection activation difference was also significant in mid-adolescence (*F*(1, 46)=4.70, *p*=.035, ηp2=.093), but with an opposite pattern, as maltreated adolescents showed a larger acceptance > rejection activation difference than nonmaltreated adolescents. Lastly, within the primary somatosensory cortex sphere, the acceptance > rejection activation difference was only significant in the mid-adolescence group (*F*(1, 46)= 6.17, *p*=.017, ηp2=.118), again with maltreated adolescents showing a larger acceptance > rejection activation difference than nonmaltreated adolescents.

In a second step, we conducted between-group analyses for early vs. mid-adolescence separately within maltreated and nonmaltreated participants. For maltreated participants, we found significant between-group effects for the acceptance > rejection activation difference within the MFG/dlPFC cluster (*F*(1, 56)=9.85, *p*=.003, ηp2=.150), the left dACC/pre-SMA sphere (*F*(1, 56)=13.54, *p*=.001, ηp2=.195), the right dACC sphere (*F*(1, 56)=8.47, *p*=.005, ηp2=.131), as well as the primary somatosensory cortex sphere (*F*(1, 56)= 10.48, *p*=.002, ηp2=.158). For all clusters, a lower activation difference for acceptance > rejection was found in young adolescents with maltreatment experiences compared to mid-adolescent participants with maltreatment history. In contrast, no significant between-group effects regarding early vs. mid-adolescence emerged for nonmaltreated participants (*p*s<.05).

****

*Figure B3.* Age x maltreatment interactions within the dACC/pre-SMA sphere and MFG/dlPFC (Acceptance > Rejection contrast).The bar graphs display the mean beta values and their standard errors for the activation difference acceptance > rejection in the (a) left dorsal anterior cingulate cortex/pre-supplementary motor area (dACC/pre-SMA; 5mm sphere at peak voxel [-6, 4, 50]) and (b) left middle frontal gyrus/dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (MFG/dlPFC; peak voxel at [-32, 38, 32]) separately for maltreated and nonmaltreated participants within the early and mid-adolescent groups. n.s. = non-significant. \* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01.

Table B5

*Main and Interaction Effects for Age and Maltreatment*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cluster  | ANOVA  |
| Anatomical region | x, y, z | Hemi-sphere | Age (*df* = 1, 96) | Group (*df* = 1, 96) | A x G (*df* = 1, 94) |
|  |  |  | *F* | ηP² | *F* | ηP² | *F* | ηP² |
| **Not-my-turn > Rejection**  |
| Premotor cortex/supplementary motor area | -26, -6, 64 | L | 0.80 | .008 | 0.66 | .007 | 2.62 | .027 |
| **Rejection > Not-my-turn** |
| Precuneus/posterior cingulate cortex (PRC/PCC) | -8, -38, 40 | L | 5.08+ | .050 | 0.03 | .000 | 1.54 | .9. .016 |
| Superior temporal gyrus  | -44, -32, 6 | L | 0.67 | .007 | 0.07 | .001 | 1.88 | .020 |
| PRC/PCC | -10, -58, 8 | L | 3.06 | .031 | 0.09 | .001 | 0.46 | .005 |
| **Rejection > Acceptance** |
| Primary visual cortex | 12, -90, -2 | R | 1.79a | .018 | 0.66 | .007 | 5.33+ | .054 |
| PCC  | -6, -38, 42 | L | 3.26a | .033 | 0.32 | .003 | 1.36 | .014 |
| Inferior frontal gyrus | -54, 26, 22 | L | 5.83+b | .057 | 0.96 | .010 | 0.77 | .008 |
| Superior temporal gyrus  | -48, -34, 6 | L | 8.82\*\*a | .084 | 0.33b | .003 | 3.89 | .040 |
| Orbitofrontal area  | 36, 38, -12 | R | 7.33+ | .071 | 0.00 | .000 | 1.30 | .014 |
| Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (PFC) | 48, 30, 20 | R | 8.82\*\* | .084 | 1.50 | .015 | 0.41 | .004 |
| Superior temporal gyrus  | -48, -16, -4 | L | 0.00a | .000 | 3.37 | .034 | 1.28 | .013 |
| Superior frontal gyrus  | -24, 24, 52 | L | 9.40\*\*b | .089 | 0.00b | .000 | 0.06 | .001 |
| Anterior insular cortex  | 42, 8, -12 | R | 2.75 | .028 | 1.09 | .011 | 0.13 | .001 |
| Parahippocampal gyrus  | -28, -28, -20 | L | 5.26+ | .052 | 1.59 | .016 | 0.26 | .003 |
| Inferior parietal lobule  | -44, -72, 38 | L | 11.53\*\*\* | .107 | 0.70 | .007 | 0.02 | .000 |
| **Acceptance > Rejection** |
| Dorsal anterior cingulate cortex/pre-supplementary motor area | -6, 4, 50 | L | 1.54 | .016 | 0.05 | .001 | 12.86\*\*\* | .120 |
| Insula/putamen | -32, 16, 10 | L | 1.95 | .020 | 0.98 | .010 | 5.91+ | .059 |
| Insula/putamen | 34, 20, 8 | R | 0.82 | .008 | 1.03 | .011 | 4.09+ | .042 |
| Hypothalamus/thalamus | -10, -20, 0 | L | 0.41 | .004 | 0.07 | .001 | 5.24+ | .053 |
| Dorsolateral PFC  | 30, 36, 30 | R | 1.41 | .014 | 1.13 | .012 | 6.63+ | .066 |
| Middle frontal gyrus/ dorsolateral PFC  | -32, 38, 32 | L | 1.36 | .014 | 1.95 | .020 | 9.01\*\* | .087 |

*Note.* Analyses are based on extracted and averaged raw activation values (betas) from clusters that were significant in the respective initial whole-brain analysis (*p* < 0.05 FWE-corrected at voxel level, *k* > 20 voxels). x, y, z refer to MNI coordinates. a If the assumption of variance homogeneity was not met, we tested the effect with Welch's *F*, revealing the same results. b If the residuals were not normally distributed, we tested the effect with the Mann-Whitney *U* test, revealing the same results.

+ *p* < .05, but not significant after correction for multiple comparisons. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p* < .001.
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1. The order of two paradigms was counterbalanced and evenly distributed between the maltreated and nonmaltreated group. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Data were checked for outliers (i.e., residuals ± 3 SDs from the mean). Five identified outliers on five variables were winsorized (set to the next boundary value within 3 SDs). Analyses were conducted with and without winsorized values, yielding comparable results. Reported results are based on effects with winsorized values. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. To clarify the nature of the observed interaction effects, we conducted two post-hoc analyses for each cluster (i.e., left MFG/dlPFC and left dACC/pre-SMA sphere) in which we assessed the between-group effects of maltreatment x age for the simple contrasts of each condition: (a) rejection vs baseline (null), and (b) acceptance vs baseline (null). A significant between-group effect of maltreatment x age for activation during rejection, but not acceptance, emerged in the left dACC/pre-SMA sphere (*F*(1,94)=4.40, *p*=.039, ηp2=.045). Although not significant, post-hoc comparisons for the left dACC/pre-SMA sphere indicated an increased activation to rejection in early adolescent maltreated participants, contrasted by a decreased activation in mid-adolescent maltreated participants in comparison to nonmaltreated controls. In contrast, the between-group maltreatment x age effect was significant for activation during acceptance, but not rejection events in the left MFG/dlPFC (*F*(1,94)=9.62, *p*=.003, ηp2=.093). Post-hoc comparisons indicated an opposing pattern with decreased activation in young maltreated adolescents (*p*<.01) and increased activation in mid-adolescent maltreated participants when compared to nonmaltreated controls (*p*>.05). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)