

**Rationale and design of the Healthy Brain Study: an accessible resource for understanding the human brain and how it dynamically and individually operates in its bio-social context**

**HBS consortium**

Corresponding authors on behalf of the HBS consortium: [lucy.overbeek@radboudumc.nl](mailto:lucy.overbeek@radboudumc.nl) and [Guillen.fernandez@donders.ru.nl](mailto:Guillen.fernandez@donders.ru.nl)

**Abstract**

The endeavor to understand the human brain has seen more progress in the last few decades than in the previous two millennia. Still, our understanding of how the human brain relates to behavior in the real world and how this link is modulated by biological, social, and environmental factors is limited. To address this, we designed the Healthy Brain Study (HBS), an interdisciplinary, longitudinal, cohort study based on multidimensional, dynamic assessments in both the laboratory and the real world. Here, we describe the rationale and design of the currently ongoing HBS. The HBS is examining a population-based sample of 1,000 healthy participants (age 30-39) who are thoroughly studied across an entire year. Data are collected through cognitive, affective, behavioral, and physiological testing, neuroimaging, bio-sampling, questionnaires, ecological momentary assessment, and real-world assessments using wearable devices. These data will become an accessible resource for the scientific community enabling the next step in understanding the human brain and how it dynamically and individually operates in its bio-social context. An access procedure to the collected data and bio-samples is in place and published on <https://www.healthybrainstudy.nl/en/data-and-methods>. <https://www.trialregister.nl/trial/7955>

## Introduction

The human brain is seen as civilization's most precious resource<sup>1</sup>, both creating and interacting with our increasingly complex environment, it enables us to be conscious and social human beings. Brain functioning also plays a pivotal role in major societal challenges such as health, demographic change, and well-being. Due to developments in different scientific fields, the endeavor to understand the human brain has seen more progress in the last few decades than in the two millennia before. However, we think that current brain research suffers from at least five key limitations and we set up the Healthy Brain Study (HBS) to tackle these five limitations together and, thereby, to facilitate our understanding of how the human brain relates to behavior in the real world and how this link is modulated by biological, social, and environmental factors. In the following paragraphs, we explain the five main design choices of the HBS.

Firstly, a reductionist approach – in which researchers try to understand reality by focusing on a limited number of variables – has been understandably popular as it is vital to obtain detailed mechanistic insights. However, complex dynamical systems, like the human brain, cannot be properly understood by focusing on just one aspect at a time<sup>2-4</sup>. Human brain functioning includes enabling consciousness and cognition, generating emotions, and producing adaptive behavior, and it performs all of these functions while embedded in its biological and social (bio-social) environment<sup>5</sup>. To enable researchers to understand the complexity of human brain functioning in its bio-social context, the HBS provides a *broad range of variables* within a holistic approach.

Secondly, the brain's operations cannot be fully understood by single assessments obtained at a specific point in time, but require repeated measurements or continuous monitoring. Single-session assessments may be sufficient to uncover stable traits or processes. However, they do not capture changes in brain functioning that constitute a core feature of our plastic and adaptive brain<sup>6,7</sup>. Similarly, the body and the social environment are subject to change. For example, seasonality is

observed in affect <sup>8,9</sup>, behavior <sup>9,10</sup>, and biological <sup>11-14</sup> and social <sup>9</sup> factors. Most of the studies mentioned were cross-sectional and explicitly stress the need for longitudinal studies that assess within-subject variation. Therefore, in the HBS, participants perform *repeated assessments* in three different seasons over one year starting at varying time points within a year. Thereby, we aim to reliably and validly capture changes in human brain operations that may be related not only to seasonality, but also to relevant life events and incidental or dynamic changes in biological factors (e.g., inflammation markers), social factors (e.g., household composition, work relations, friendships, politics, media exposure, lockdown), and environmental factors (e.g., daylight hours, exposure to chemicals).

Thirdly, group averages are critical in revealing general principles, but they gloss over differences that make us individual human beings. The human brain is arguably the most individual organ we have and is shaped by our experiences throughout life. Therefore, a large and rich sample is required before *single subject inferences* can be made about underlying principles of diversity in cognition, affect, and behavior <sup>15,16</sup>. Given this, the HBS aims to include a broad range of repeated assessments of 1,000 participants.

Fourthly, laboratory assessments enable well-controlled analyses, but they may show low ecological validity in generalizing cognition, affect, and behavior to real-world settings. To understand cognition, affect, and behavior more comprehensively, there is a need for assessments both in the laboratory as well as in the real world <sup>17,18</sup>. In the HBS, we perform a *real-world assessment* of physical activity, stress, and sleep with validated wearable devices. Furthermore, we apply ecological momentary assessments using a smartphone application. Taken together, these assessments enable us to understand cognition, affect, and behavior in the context where they naturally occur.

Finally, a healthy volunteer selection bias is a frequent problem in both cohort studies and neuroscience studies. For example, UK Biobank participants were more likely to be female, have a healthy lifestyle, and live in less socioeconomically deprived areas compared to the general population<sup>19</sup>. Also, students, the usual participants in cognitive neuroscience studies, function well, are often relatively healthy and have a high socioeconomic status<sup>20</sup>. Also, most population-based cohorts and large-scale studies include either developing populations<sup>21-23</sup> or advanced aging populations<sup>24-26</sup>. Therefore, the HBS includes a broad *population-based sample* of individuals who are 30-39 years old that reflects the general population in terms of gender and educational attainment. The age range was chosen to represent adults beyond the age of developmental brain changes and before the onset of brain changes due to advanced aging or neurodegenerative disease. The lower limit of 30 years excludes any neurodevelopment effect as the brain has matured by this point<sup>27</sup>. Also, 30-39 is a socially challenging age range because it is generally characterized by a relatively high number of rather impactful life events (e.g., family planning, career-related changes, buying a house).

In conclusion, the unique feature of the HBS is that it combines in-depth phenotyping of a large range of cognitive, affective, behavioral, and social dimensions with a biological sampling of brain and body-related processes. This enables the extraction of a detailed bio-social fingerprint for the participants in the cohort. Such a detailed fingerprint is currently not available. The availability of HBS will contribute to a better understanding of risks and potentials in behavior in the real world at the individual level. This paper describes the rationale and design of the currently ongoing HBS, which originated from an interdisciplinary, team science<sup>28</sup> based cross-faculty initiative from the Radboud campus in Nijmegen, the Netherlands, including Radboud University, Radboud University Medical Center, and the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

## Methods/design

### *Study design and setting*

The HBS is a longitudinal cohort study in both laboratory and real-world settings. All laboratory assessments take place at a single-center on Radboud campus, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

### *Participants*

The HBS aims to include 1,000 participants (500 men and 500 women) from the Nijmegen region ( $\leq 15$  km) of whom 220 have a low, 340 a middle, and 430 a high level of education. Nijmegen is a medium-sized city in the east of the Netherlands with 176,731 citizens on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2019 of whom 74% are native Dutch, which is comparable to the overall proportion of native Dutch citizens of the Netherlands (76%)<sup>29</sup>. In contrast, large cities ( $> 500,000$  citizens) in the west of the Netherlands like Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and The Hague have respectively 46%, 48%, 45% native Dutch citizens<sup>29</sup>. Regarding educational attainment, 22% of Nijmegen citizens are primary and secondary educated (low level), 34% are primary, secondary, and vocationally educated (middle level), and 43% of the population have also a university degree (high level). Nijmegen has less citizens with low and middle level of education and more citizens with high level of education compared to the overall proportions of Dutch citizens (28%, 41%, 30% of citizens have respectively low, middle, and high level of education)<sup>29</sup>. In comparison, some large cities in the Netherlands have a higher proportion of citizens with a high level of education (e.g., Amsterdam 48%, Utrecht 52%), while other large cities have a higher proportion of citizens with a low level of education (e.g., Rotterdam 32%, The Hague 31%)<sup>29</sup>.

Inclusion criteria are age 30-39 years, living in the Nijmegen region ( $\leq 15$ km; because of feasibility), willingness, and ability to follow the study protocol. Exclusion criteria are: not speaking, reading, and/or understanding the Dutch language (minimum B1 level), a prior history of significant psychiatric or neurological illness (self-report), a current disease that affects the brain, a current medication that is therapeutically targeted at the brain (e.g., antidepressants, methylphenidate), pregnancy, contra-

indication for MRI (metal or devices in the upper body (cardiac pacemaker, cochlear implant, aneurism clip), previous brain surgery, moderate to severe claustrophobia), contra-indication for the submaximal Åstrand cycle test (current use of beta-blockers, a current disease that hinders physical exercise), contra-indication for the cold pressor test (Raynaud's phenomenon, chronic pain syndrome in shoulder or arm, open wounds on arm or hand, scleroderma, arteriovenous fistula or shunt, presence of (unstable) angina pectoris).

### *Recruitment*

We apply different strategies to recruit participants. Firstly, municipalities, general practitioners, and employers of different sectors based in the Nijmegen region send the HBS invitation and research flyer to their citizens, clients, and employees, respectively. Employers are asked to sponsor the study by (partly) exempting their employees from three working days which allows them to participate in three lab visits. Employees remain entirely free to decide whether or not they want to participate. Also, campaigns to increase awareness of the HBS have been launched.

Potential participants fill out contact details in an online form on the website <https://www.healthybrainstudy.nl> and receive the study brochure. Participants can watch short videos on the website that explain the various tests and assessments or learn about the experiences of an HBS participant. Participants are contacted via phone and invited to a face-to-face information meeting on the Radboud campus. Participants provide written informed consent at this meeting before participation.

### *Ethics*

The Institutional Review Board of Radboud University Medical Center approved the HBS (reference number: 2018-4894) in accordance with the latest revision of the Declaration of Helsinki<sup>30</sup>. Incidental findings could occur both while conducting the study (e.g., observed during assessments) and while

using the data and biosamples in the future to answer research questions. If a researcher or research assistant notices a potential finding incidentally, he/she will contact the principal investigator, who approaches an incidental findings committee. At the Radboud Campus, such committees exist for neuroimaging and genetics. For other findings, the principal investigator contacts a medical doctor with relevant expertise. If, according to the committee or medical expert, no clinically relevant finding is identified, the participant remains uninformed. In all other cases, the participant's general practitioner is sent a letter describing the findings. At the same time, the participant receives a request to contact their general practitioner. Participants must consent to this procedure and provide the contact details of their general practitioner, otherwise, they are not allowed to participate.

#### *Participant panel, feedback of participants, incentives, and citizen science*

A participant panel consisting of twelve people (age 30-39, 6 women and 6 men) was set up to aid in the design of the study. The panel advises on communication materials and incentives. For example, the panel gives feedback on the website, study information, posters, and flyers. Moreover, the first 243 participants filled out a questionnaire on their experience of the first lab visit, which provided us with feedback on the study procedures and on keeping participants involved. For example, we developed an online dashboard, because participants indicated that they would prefer more individual feedback on results. Participants receive gadgets after each assessment, and we organize (online) participant events. After completion of the study protocol, participants receive €150 with a maximal addition of €50 for assessment specific incentives.

Besides, a citizen science platform is used to involve participants as well as other citizens in generating research topics and questions that can be investigated with the HBS resource<sup>31</sup>. We 'crowdsource' lists of research topics and/or research questions that participants and citizens think are useful for examining with the HBS resource. At the same time, they also rate the importance of the crowd-

generated suggestions by other participants and citizens resulting in an overview that reflects the relevance and prioritization of their overall input.

#### *Quality management and safety*

Research assistants and nurses received extensive training for the assessments undertaken as part of the study protocol. We adapted existing standardized operating procedures (SOPs) if available and developed a new SOP otherwise. An independent study monitor annually performs checks to ensure that the study protocol is followed.

#### *Data management*

We use Ldot, which is a web application that only stores personal and logistical data, for communication with our participants (<https://www.health-ri.nl/services/ldot-workflow-tool-clinical-research>). For data acquisition, we use Castor EDC (<https://data.castoredc.com>) to provide electronic case report forms and online questionnaires. In addition, a smartphone application for ecological momentary assessments was developed. After participants have performed the real-world assessments, our data managers extract the raw data that is stored locally on the device. Biosamples are stored at the Radboud Biobank with their sample tracking system, sample processing SOPs, and standardized sample storage conditions being employed<sup>32</sup>. Furthermore, a Polymorphic Encryption and Pseudonymization (PEP) infrastructure was developed for the HBS to protect all data streams and the privacy of participants<sup>33,34</sup> (Figure 1). Ldot, Castor EDC, the smartphone application, and PEP meet the requirements of the European General Data Protection Regulation.

For each participant, the PEP-system generates unique pseudonyms for the different assessments to avoid the coupling of data to an individual participant during the data collection phase (step 1: collect). A backup of the data is stored locally (step 2: produce) and a copy is encrypted and transferred to the data repository (step 3: store). In the same step, the data are cryptographically pseudonymized. The



data can only be decrypted in the processing environment where scientific analyses are performed (step 4: process). The PEP method ensures that different datasets obtained from the repository cannot be linked easily by different research projects because pseudonyms identifying a single participant are personalized at the project level, and data transfer can be minimized based on researchers' requirements. Derived data, produced by researchers, can be stored in the data repository (step 5: contribute) for future use by other researchers using their researcher-specific pseudonyms.

The PEP-system was created to deal with the rigidity of the traditional encryption/decryption process by using polymorphic encryption. PEP ensures that there is no need to a priori fix the encryption key for the data. The PEP system enables different research teams to have access to the entire dataset or only a subset (of participants and variables) of the data source with a specific, personalized decryption key. Due to its additional security, the PEP system is an ideal approach to store, manage, and share sensitive personal data in a research data repository that reduces the risk of a participant's privacy being violated.





Figure 1. The Polymorphic Encryption and Pseudonymization (PEP) infrastructure.

Measures

The following paragraphs describe the measures briefly, while the supplementary information provides detailed descriptions. Each assessment starts with pre-visit online questionnaires, followed by a burst week of real-world assessments, followed by a whole day lab visit, which in turn is followed by post-visit online questionnaires and assessments (Figure 2). Only those constructs that may be sensitive to change during one year (states) are repeated during the second and third assessments. The stable (trait) measures are equally distributed over the three assessments. The majority of measures are validated in prior research.



At home      Radboud Campus

Figure 2. Design of data collection in the Healthy Brain Study

235 *Pre-visit online questionnaires*

236 Participants fill out questionnaires before the start of the burst week to assess baseline characteristics.  
237 The questionnaires cover general demographic questions and questions about lifestyle and well-being  
238 (Table 1a).

239

240 *Burst week with real-world assessments*

241 The burst week consists of a real-world assessment of physical activity, stress, and sleep using validated  
242 wearable devices (Table 2) and ecological momentary assessments (EMA) using a smartphone  
243 application. The questionnaire for EMA covers mood, social company, online social interactions,  
244 context, control items, retrospection, anticipation, and substance use. In addition, participants  
245 perform the home collection of stool, urine, saliva, and diffusive sampling of chemicals using silicone  
246 wristbands during the burst week (Table 3).

247

248 *Lab visit Radboud campus*

249 Each eight-hour lab visit includes bio-sampling (Table 3), neuroimaging (Table 4), physiological (Table  
250 2), cognitive (Table 5), affective (Table 5), behavioral (Table 5), and sensory assessments (Table 6). To  
251 avoid systematic carry-over and fatigue effects, the order of assessments varies between and within  
252 participants except for fasting blood sampling and blood pressure at the start of the day.

253

254 *Post-visit online questionnaires and assessments*

255 Participants fill out an online questionnaire assessing (mental) health, life events, social/relationships,  
256 work, politics, personality, and literacy after each lab visit (Table 1b). Also, participants perform several  
257 online assessments about decision-making, narrative reading, and solidarity (Table 7). After their third  
258 and final lab visit, participants are invited to complete the 'Individual Differences in Language Skills'  
259 test battery (Table 8) assessing participants' linguistic knowledge, as well as linguistic processing and  
260 general cognitive skills.

261 *COVID-19 questionnaire*

262 From March until July 2020, when the assessment of participants was not allowed due to the COVID-  
263 19 measures, the included participants at that point (N=158) received a monthly questionnaire  
264 addressing behavior and worries regarding COVID-19, currently experienced anxiety <sup>35</sup>, stress <sup>36</sup>, and  
265 well-being <sup>37</sup>. Moreover, loneliness <sup>38</sup>, sedentary behavior <sup>39</sup>, and sleep quality <sup>40</sup> were assessed. We  
266 used the same questionnaires as we use in the three repeated assessments (Table 1a and 1b).

Table 1a. Pre-visit online questionnaires

Domain	Name of the questionnaire	What does it measure?	Duration (minutes)	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Ref
General information	Demographic and socio-economic background	Demographic data, the highest level of education, income, household composition	10	x	x	x	41
	Pregnancy	Number of pregnancies, time to pregnancy, pregnancy outcome, fertility treatment, hormones (anticonception), breastfeeding, current child wish	3	x			
	Menstrual cycle	Menstrual cycle	1	x	x	x	
Lifestyle	Smoking history	Past behavior, age of onset	1	x			
	Smoking	Current behavior, frequency, and quantity	1	x	x	x	
	Fagerstrom Test of Nicotine Dependence (FTND)	Nicotine dependence (for current or ever smokers)	2	x	x	x	42
	Alcohol	Frequency and quantity in the last month, age of onset of alcohol use, binge drinking	2	x	x	x	
	Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test (AUDIT)	Heavy alcohol use and associated problems	3	x	x	x	43
	Substance matrix Mate-q	Amount and frequency of substance use	5	x	x	x	44
	Food Frequency Questionnaire (FFQ)	Quantitative food intake	45	x			45-48
	Sedentary Behavior Questionnaire (SBQ)	Sedentary behavior in various domains (e.g. home, work, transportation)	5	x	x	x	39
	Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index (PSQI)	Sleep quality	5	x	x	x	40
	Dream Recall Frequency Scale (DRFS)	Dream recall	1	x	x	x	49
	The Internet Gaming Disorder Scale	Problematic gaming	2	x	x	x	50
	The Social Media Disorder Scale	Problematic social media use	2	x	x	x	51
	Short Media Multitasking Measure (S-MMM)	Use of different media simultaneously	1	x	x	x	52
Well-being	Satisfaction with life scale	Well-being	2	x	x	x	53
	Cantril ladder	Well-being	1	x	x	x	37

268  
269  
270

	Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire – Short Form (FFMQ)	Mindfulness	10	x	x	x	54
--	--	-------------	----	---	---	---	----

Table 1b. Post-visit online questionnaires

Domain	Name of the questionnaire	What does it measure?	Duration (minutes)	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Ref
<b>Exposure</b>	Exposure	Exposure from environment	5	x	x	x	
<b>Health</b>	Over-the-counter medication	Use of nonprescription medication like pain relievers, cough suppressants, etc.	1	x	x	x	55
	Health complaints	Complaints like tiredness, nausea, back pain, headache, etc.	5	x	x	x	56
<b>Mental Health</b>	Adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS)	Symptom scale for ADHD	10	x			57
	Autistic Trait Questionnaire (ATQ)	Autistic traits	5	x			58
	Self-Report Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology (IDS-SR)	Presence and severity of depressive symptoms	5	x	x	x	59
	Anxiety Sensitivity Index (ASI)	Anxiety (trait)	5			x	60
	State and Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-S)	Anxiety (state)	5	x	x	x	35
	Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)	Stress	5	x	x	x	36
	Utrecht Burnout Scale (UBOS)	Burnout	3	x	x	x	61
	Reactive Proactive Aggression Questionnaire (RPQ)	Aggression	5	x	x	x	62
	Daily hassles	Daily hassles	5	x	x	x	63
	Cognitive emotion regulation questionnaire (CERQ)	Cognitive regulation of emotion	5	x	x	x	64
<b>Life events</b>	Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ)	Adverse childhood experiences	5		x		65
	Life events	Threatening life experiences	10	x	x	x	66
<b>Social/ Relationship</b>	UCLA loneliness scale	Loneliness	5	x	x	x	38
	Need to belong scale	Belongingness	3	x	x	x	67

	Multidimensional scale of Perceived Social Support (PSS)	Perceived social support	5	x	x	x	68
<b>Work</b>	Exposure to work	Working hours, working schedules, type of employment	4	x	x	x	
	Survey Work-home Interaction – NijmeGen (SWING)	Work-life balance	4	x	x	x	69
	Workplace commitment		5	x	x	x	70
	Employability		5	x	x	x	71,72
	Questionnaire on the Experience and Evaluation of Work (QEEW)	Job characteristics	7	x <sup>1</sup>			73
<b>Politics</b>	Populism index	Attitude toward populism	2	x	x	x	
	Political efficacy	Attitude towards national government and politics	2	x	x	x	74
	Political participation	Political activities	1	x	x	x	
	EU membership	Attitude towards EU membership	1	x	x	x	75
<b>Personality</b>	BIG-5 NEO-FFI-3	Openness to experience, conscientiousness, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness	10	x			76
	Sensory Processing Sensitivity (SPS)	High sensitivity	5			x	77
	Barratt Impulsiveness Scale (BIS-11)	Impulsiveness	10		x		78
	Self-control		10	x			79
	New general self-efficacy scale	Self-efficacy	5		x		80
	Dispositional greed	Greediness	3			x	81
	Dark triad	Narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy	5	x			82
	Social investment attitudes	Attitudes toward corporate social responsibility	5		x		83
<b>Literacy</b>	Numeracy test	Mathematical abilities	12		x		84
	Financial literacy	Financial attitudes, skills	20			x	85
	Graph literacy	Ability to understand the meaning of graphs	10	x			86
	Cultural intelligence	Ability to relate and work effectively across cultures	2			x	87

271

<sup>1</sup> Participants fill out their job characteristics at the first assessment. In the second and third assessments, they fill out their job characteristics only in case of a new job.

272

Table 2. Physiological assessments

Domain	Measure	Location	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Ref
Physical activity	Fitness	Campus	x	x	x	88
	Sedentary behavior	Home <sup>1</sup>	x	x	x	89,90
Stress	Heart rate	Campus	x	x	x	
		Home <sup>1</sup>	x	x	x	91
	Heart rate variability	Home <sup>1</sup>	x	x	x	91
	Skin conductance	Home <sup>1</sup>	x	x	x	91
	Skin temperature	Home <sup>1</sup>	x	x	x	91
	Startle eye-blink	Campus	x	x	x	92
	Subjective stress levels	Campus	x	x	x	93
		Home <sup>2</sup>	x	x	x	
Sleep	Sleep duration	Home <sup>1</sup>	x	x	x	
	Sleep stages	Home <sup>1</sup>	x	x	x	
Body composition	Weight	Campus	x	x	x	
	Height	Campus	x	x	x	
	Waist-hip circumference	Campus	x	x	x	
	Body fat	Campus	x	x	x	94
	Fat weight	Campus	x	x	x	
	Total body water	Campus	x	x	x	
	Skeletal muscle mass	Campus	x	x	x	
	Body fat mass index	Campus	x	x	x	
	Fat-free mass index	Campus	x	x	x	
Pain	Subjective pain levels	Campus	x	x	x	93,95
		Home <sup>1</sup>	x	x	x	
	Electrical pain thresholds	Campus	x	x	x	96,97
Cardiovascular	Blood pressure	Campus	x	x	x	98
	Carotid artery reactivity	Campus	x	x	x	99

<sup>1</sup> By wearable device, <sup>2</sup> By ecological momentary assessment (EMA).

273

274

275



276 Table 3: Biosamples and silicone wristband

Biosample	Measure	Location	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Ref
<b>Stool</b>	Gut microbiome	Home	x	x	x	12,32,100
<b>Urine</b> (first morning)	Ions, such as calcium, potassium, sodium, magnesium	Home	x	x	x	32,101
<b>Saliva</b>	Cortisol levels (short term; two baseline samples)	Home	x	x	x	102
	Cortisol levels (short term; before, immediately after, and 20 minutes after acute challenge)	Campus	x	x	x	
<b>Blood - EDTA plasma</b>	DNA	Campus	6 ml*			32
<b>Blood - PAX gene</b>	RNA	Campus	3x 2,5 ml*	3x 2,5 ml*	3x 2,5 ml*	
<b>Blood - EDTA plasma</b>	Future analyses	Campus	4x 10 ml* 1x 3 ml*	4x 10 ml* 1x 3 ml*	4x 10 ml* 1x 3 ml*	
<b>Blood - serum</b>	Future analyses (e.g., antibodies, proteomics)	Campus	10 ml*	10 ml*	10 ml*	
<b>Blood - heparin plasma</b>	Future analyses (e.g., hormones, metabolomics)	Campus	2x 10 ml*	2x 10 ml*	2x 10 ml*	
<b>Hair</b>	Cortisol levels (long term)	Campus	x	x	x	103
<b>Silicone wristband</b>	Exposure to chemicals in the surrounding environment	Home	x	x	x	104,105

277 \*The indicated volumes refer to whole blood volumes

278 Table 4. Neuroimaging at the campus

Scan	Description	Duration (minutes)	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Ref
<b>Dummy scanner</b>		10	x			
<b>T1w 3D MPRAGE</b>	Anatomical scan	5	x	x	x	106,107
<b>rfMRI</b>	Resting-state functional scan followed by resting-state questionnaire	10	x	x	x	
<b>mfMRI</b>	Movie functional scan	4,5	x	x	x	
<b>Scout, fieldmap, single-band reference EPIs</b>	Auxiliary scans	2	x	x	x	
<b>Diffusion-weighted imaging scan</b>	Structural connectivity characterizations and white matter tissue microstructural modelling	10	x			
<b>High-resolution T1w 3D MP2RAGE anatomical scan</b>	Quantitative T1 and cortical myelin mapping	10		x		108
<b>High-resolution T2*w scan</b>	Quantitative T2* and magnetic susceptibility mapping for identification and quantification of iron deposition across the brain	10			x	109

279 Table 5. Overview of cognitive, affective, and behavioral assessments at the campus  
280

Domain	Name of task	Measure	Description	Duration (minutes)	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Ref
<b>Cognition</b>	Foraging task	The tendency to explore alternatives vs. to exploit a chosen alternative	Participants are presented with a tree and have to decide whether to harvest it for apples and incur a short harvest delay or move to a new tree and incur a longer travel delay	30	x	x	x	110
<b>Cognition</b>	Serial random-dot motion discrimination task	How predictions from the past are weighted with uncertain sensory information in the present	Participants judge the motion direction of moving dots (up vs. down) and receive auditory feedback about the correctness of their response	25	x	x	x	111
<b>Cognition</b>	Reward-driven reach-adaptation task	How willing people are to search for more rewarding outcomes in a motor task	Participants make shooting movements toward a target while holding a handle that records pulling and hand rotation movements	20	x	x	x	112
<b>Cognition</b>	Paired associate memory task	Associative Memory	Participants memorize the associations between pictures of people and names in a study phase and the memory for these associations is tested in a test phase using a cued-recall-test	7	x	x	x	113
<b>Cognition</b>	Tower of London	Executive function (planning)	Participants are presented with a startling array of different colored, same-sized balls and are requested to move the balls one-by-one, with as little moves as possible to a predefined goal array.	5	x	x	x	114
<b>Affect</b>	Contextual fear generalization task	Fear generalization	Participants are instructed to attend to the presented stimuli and learn to predict the shock in multiple contexts while assessing eye-blink startle electromyography, subjective	40	x	x	x	115

			report, and avoidance tendencies.					
<b>Affect</b>	Emotion regulation task	Emotion regulation	Participants are asked to actively regulate their emotions while either neutral or aversive pictures are presented on the computer screen	15	x	x	x	116
<b>Affect</b>	Self-referent encoding Task	Positive and negative memory bias	Participants endorse and memorize positive and negative words	8	x	x	x	117
<b>Affect</b>	Stimulus-response compatibility task	Automatic approach or avoidance tendency	Participants are presented with pictures (alcohol vs. soda) and are instructed to approach or avoid a certain condition	10	x	x	x	118
<b>Behavior</b>	Columbia card task	Risk preference	A card game that gives participants the repeated choice between risky options and safe options	22	x	x	x	119
<b>Behavior</b>	Food auction task	Reliable index of people's preference for hedonic (short-term reward) vs. healthy food (long-term reward)	Participants bid on different food items (e.g., package of M&Ms, apple)	15	x	x	x	120

Table 6. Sensory assessments

Domain	Measure	Duration (minutes)	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3
<b>Vision</b>	Contrast sensitivity	5	x		
	Visual acuity	5		x	
	Color vision	5			x
<b>Hearing</b>	Hearing ability	1	x	x	x

Table 7. Post-visit online assessments

Domain	Online task	What does it measure?	Duration (minutes)	Assessment 1	Assessment 2	Assessment 3	Ref
<b>Decision-making</b>	Higher-order risk preferences	Risk attitudes, prudence, and temperance in financial decision-making	15	x	x	x	121

	Equality equivalence test	Social preferences	10	x	x	x	122
	Ambiguity	Ambiguous risk attitudes	10	x	x	x	123
	Trust game	Trust and trustworthiness	10	x	x	x	124
	Public good game	Altruism, conditional reciprocity	15	x	x	x	125
	Time preferences	Temporal discounting	8	x	x	x	126
<b>Language</b>	Narrative reading	Comprehension of and immersion into a narrative	15	x	x	x	127
<b>Solidarity</b>	Vignettes	Culpability, in/out group	15	x	x	x	128,129

287

288

Table 8. Individual Differences in Language Skills test battery


Domain	Online task	What does it measure?	Duration (minutes)	Ref
<b>Cognition</b>	Auditory simple and choice reaction time task	Processing speed	7	130
	Letter comparison	Processing speed	5	131,132
	Visual simple and choice reaction time task	Processing speed	7	130,133
	Digit span (forward & backward)	Auditory working memory	7	134
	Corsi block tapping (forward & backward)	Visual working memory	7	135,136
	Raven's advanced progressive matrices	Non-verbal intelligence	25	137
<b>Linguistic knowledge</b>	Stairs4Words (2 Runs)	Linguistic experience: Vocabulary	7	
	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	Linguistic experience: Vocabulary	10	138,139
	Idiom recognition test	Linguistic experience: Knowledge of idiomatic expressions	3	
	Spelling test	Linguistic experience: Spelling	5	
	Author recognition test	Linguistic experience: Print exposure	5	140
	Prescriptive grammar	Linguistic experience: Prescriptive grammar knowledge	10	141
<b>Linguistic processing</b>	Picture naming	Word production	7	130
	Rapid automatized naming	Word production	7	
	Verbal fluency	Word production	5	142
	Antonym production	Word production	5	143
	Maximal speech rate	Word production	3	
	Phrase generation	Sentence production	10	
	Sentence generation (active/passive sentence formulation)	Sentence production	12	
	Sentence generation (event apprehension)	Sentence production	10	
	Spontaneous speech	Sentence production	4	144
	Non-Word monitoring in non-word lists in noise	Word comprehension	10	
	Rhyme judgment	Word comprehension	5	
	Lexical decision	Word comprehension	7	130
	Semantic categorization	Word comprehension	5	
	Word monitoring in sentences in noise	Sentence comprehension	10	
	Grammatical gender cues	Sentence comprehension	10	145
	Verb-specific selective restrictions	Sentence comprehension	7	146,147
	Self-paced reading	Sentence comprehension	5	

## **Results - progress so far**

Figure 3 presents the progress and milestones of the Healthy Brain Study. The first participant was included on the 9<sup>th</sup> of September, 2019. At the end of December, 2020, the HBS included 298 participants. Forty participants (13%) withdrew from the study so far, due to personal circumstances (e.g., pregnancy) or too much burden. Most participants withdrew after the first assessment. To date, participants performed 376 lab visits: 257 participants carried out the first assessment, 83 participants the second assessment, and 36 participants the third assessment completing the entire study protocol. The COVID-19 pandemic interrupted the data acquisition phase. At that point, the HBS included 158 participants. Due to the lockdown, we canceled all assessments involving physical interaction as of the 16<sup>th</sup> of March, 2020. The HBS resumed participant assessments on the 15<sup>th</sup> of July, 2020 in compliance with the directives in force in the Netherlands. As a result, some participants (48%) have more than four months between repeated assessments. Besides, some participants (10%) have a delay between the burst week with real-world assessments and the lab visit at the Radboud campus.

# Healthy Brain Study

Het dertigersbrein ontrafeld



Project leader  
Guillén Fernández  
guillen.fernandez@donders.ru.nl

Project manager  
Lucy Overbeek  
lucy.overbeek@radboudumc.nl

[www.healthybrainstudy.nl/en](http://www.healthybrainstudy.nl/en)

304

305 Figure 3. Progress and milestones of the Healthy Brain Study

## Discussion

This paper presents the design of the currently ongoing HBS, which will result in a unique and accessible resource for the scientific community and its public and private partners. Data are collected through cognitive, affective, behavioral, and physiological testing, neuroimaging, bio-sampling, questionnaires, ecological momentary assessment, and real-world assessment using wearable devices. We believe that the HBS complements other studies – small and large –, which together enable the scientific community to take the next step in understanding the human brain and how it dynamically and individually operates in its bio-social context. Here, we present examples of research opportunities including citizen science, reflect on the HBS design choices and study population, and discuss our data security system which enables future data sharing.

### *Examples of research opportunities*

The HBS resource will be used to address expert and citizen-driven research questions that usually pertain to complex interactions between multiple factors. The first example of an expert-driven research question pertains to the association between income and positive affect. It was found among US residents that higher income was associated with more happiness and enjoyment, and less sadness and worry, but only up to a point (\$75,000 per year), above that, there was no relationship between income and emotional well-being<sup>148</sup>. The HBS resource can help explain the interplay between affect, social and biological data, and income. A second example of a complex interaction is that sedentary behavior is associated with poor health and higher mortality<sup>149,150</sup>. Merely standing up from time to time, e.g., to walk around a bit protects against part of this health risk<sup>151</sup>. Existing research on this topic has mainly focused on the consequences of prolonged sitting and has overlooked the key question of why people choose to stand up (when they sit) or sit down (when they stand), in the first place. In other words, what psychological processes (e.g., related to effort, reward, affect, and fatigue) are associated with healthy and unhealthy sedentary behavior? Answering this question will pave the way for the development of novel, targeted interventions that will improve (occupational) health<sup>152</sup>.



332

333 The HBS resource will also be used for citizen science. Different forms of citizen science exist. Projects  
334 can be led by experts, community-led, or co-created with different aims and levels of participation <sup>153</sup>.  
335 HBS participants and other citizens generate research questions to be answered with the HBS resource.  
336 In traditional designs, scientists test hypotheses that are often based on previous findings within their  
337 research domain or their intuitions. However, people living in or with specific conditions (i.e., being in  
338 their thirties and going through a key life event) may have additional insight on top of existing expert-  
339 knowledge. These insights are uncovered by a citizen science platform. The essence of the platform is  
340 to leverage collective intelligence from a large group of participants versus a smaller number of  
341 experts. This can reveal topics and research questions that have a significant influence on people's  
342 behavior in the real world and their health status, which experts may have left untouched <sup>154-157</sup>. By  
343 giving citizens a voice in scientific research, it can contribute considerably to the valorization of  
344 research results.

345

#### 346 *Reflection on design choices and study population*

347 Comprehension of complex interactions as illustrated above requires an interdisciplinary, team science  
348 approach <sup>28</sup>. The HBS design is the result of an orchestrated cross-campus process over 22 months in  
349 which 250 scientists from all classical faculties were involved and were challenged to look past the  
350 horizons of their disciplines in a few plenary meetings and several smaller working groups, all providing  
351 input to a multidisciplinary scientific board that made the final design decisions. Here, we reflect on  
352 our design choices and the study population selected.

353

354 First of all, to capture the complexity of the human brain and its environment, a large set of measures  
355 was provided. We sought a balance between comprehensiveness, local expertise, costs, and burden  
356 for the participants. This resulted in an extensive number, variety, duration of mostly validated  
357 assessments, albeit not perfectly comprehensive. For example, the neuroimaging protocol is largely

aligned with the Human Connectome Project<sup>158</sup> and UK Biobank<sup>159</sup> brain imaging, but includes a movie fMRI scan that is not included in the Human Connectome Project and UK Biobank, while the latter include scans that are not included in the HBS. Furthermore, instead of continuous monitoring over one year with validated wearable devices, the HBS covers three times a burst week of real-world assessments. Also, the collection of GPS data, financial transactions, and social media interactions were not allowed due to legal restrictions and privacy concerns.

Secondly, the HBS includes three repeated assessments for about one year. These repetitions aim to capture changes in human brain operations that may be related to relevant life events, seasonality, and/or incidental or dynamic changes in the biological and social environment. Regarding seasonality, the HBS participants start at varying time points within a year, so, although we sample only three instead of four times over one year, across participants we sample seasonal transitions in a fine-grained manner.

Thirdly, the HBS aims to include 1,000 participants. Due to differences in measurement-specific signal-to-noise properties, it is not possible to provide a straightforward power and sample size calculation because the data enables analyses of various cognitive, affective, and behavioral interactions in their bio-social context. To decide on the number of participants, we sought a balance between sensitivity and feasibility. The chosen number of participants is high compared to traditional neuroscientific experiments revealing general principles but is low compared to disease risk-oriented cohorts (which is not the aim of the HBS) like the UK Biobank<sup>26</sup>, the Rotterdam Study<sup>24</sup>, or the Rhineland Study<sup>25</sup>. However, the number is comparable to other studies designed to capture inter-individual differences like the Human Connectome Project, which included 1,200 young healthy adults<sup>158</sup>, or the Personalized Parkinson Project, which included 650 patients<sup>160</sup>. We consider the number large given the comprehensive range of repeated measures both in the laboratory as in the real world.

Fourthly, we developed a recruitment strategy targeted at a sample that represents the 30-39-year-old population of Nijmegen and its surroundings in terms of gender and educational attainment. However, a reasonable level of reading, speaking, and understanding Dutch (B1 level) is required to be able to complete the study protocol, e.g., to fill out questionnaires. This implies that the HBS participants do not fully represent the Nijmegen population at large, because in this example the illiterate, people with low literacy, or non-Dutch speaking individuals are excluded. However, the aim of including 220 participants with a low, 340 with a middle, and 430 with a high level of education enables the study of interacting social factors.

#### *Digital security system and data sharing*

The HBS resource will be accessible to the scientific community at large. The resource contains sensitive personal data that needs to be protected from unauthorized access and unintentional disclosure. The sharing of (big) data within the scientific community is necessary for progress and maximizes scientific benefits derived from valuable and costly data. The HBS data is protected by a digital security system, a Polymorphic Encryption and Pseudonymization (PEP) infrastructure<sup>33</sup>, which allows the sharing of data with researchers worldwide while safeguarding participants' privacy in line with the European General Data Protection Regulation. The digital security system is based on a multi-point, privacy-by-design strategy: (a) participants provide informed consent, also for the important element of data sharing; (b) signed contractual agreements with researchers are in place to ensure that no attempts towards de-pseudonymization, linking or commercialization of the raw data will be attempted; (c) governance policies limit access to the data to qualified researchers only; (d) an innovative pseudonymization and encryption process is applied<sup>34</sup>.

An access procedure is in place and published on <https://www.healthybrainstudy.nl/en/data-and-methods>. We stratify researchers into three tiers with different rights. Tier I consists of researchers from the Radboud campus that contributed to study design or data acquisition. Tier II consists of all

other researchers from the Radboud campus. Tier III consists of publicly financed researchers from other academic institutions. Companies can apply in all tiers, but they cannot apply independently. Application for data starts with the submission of a data request for a project that has been preregistered, e.g., in the Open Science Framework. Then, the HBS scientific board reviews the application. After approval, the researcher signs a data/material transfer agreement. Next, the researcher receives data and/or samples. The Radboud Biobank provides the samples<sup>32</sup>. All processed data and samples with relevant documentation (including scripts and data and/or samples processing protocols) must be integrated back into the HBS resource so that it can be used by others. Finally, the researcher publishes the results by acknowledging the HBS consortium.

#### *Conclusion*

The HBS has been designed using a team science approach to integrate scientific disciplines and is characterized by a broad range of repeated assessments, a large number of participants, both laboratory and real-world assessments, and a population-based sample. Moreover, data is managed to allow data sharing with scientists worldwide while maintaining participants' privacy. With the HBS resource, the scientific community can take the next step in understanding the human brain and how it dynamically and individually operates in its bio-social context.

## 427 References

- 428 1 G-Science Academies Statement. Understanding, protecting, and developing global brain  
429 resources: [https://royalsociety.org/about-us/international/international-work/g-science-](https://royalsociety.org/about-us/international/international-work/g-science-academies-meetings/)  
430 [academies-meetings/](https://royalsociety.org/about-us/international/international-work/g-science-academies-meetings/). (2016).
- 431 2 Bruineberg, J., Kiverstein, J. & Rietveld, E. The anticipating brain is not a scientist: the free-  
432 energy principle from an ecological-enactive perspective. *Synthese* **195**, 2417-2444 (2018).
- 433 3 Kiverstein, J. & Miller, M. The embodied brain: towards a radical embodied cognitive  
434 neuroscience. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* **9** (2015).
- 435 4 Clark, A. *Being there: putting mind, body, and world together again*. (1997).
- 436 5 Chiel, H. J. & Beer, R. D. The brain has a body: adaptive behavior emerges from interactions of  
437 nervous system, body and environment. *Trends Neurosci* **20**, 553-557 (1997).
- 438 6 Hermans, E. J. *et al.* Stress-related noradrenergic activity prompts large-scale neural network  
439 reconfiguration. *Science* **334**, 1151-1153 (2011).
- 440 7 Haeger, A., Costa, A. S., Schulz, J. B. & Reetz, K. Cerebral changes improved by physical activity  
441 during cognitive decline: A systematic review on MRI studies. *NeuroImage: Clinical* **23**, 101933  
442 (2019).
- 443 8 Lyall, L. M. *et al.* Seasonality of depressive symptoms in women but not in men: A cross-  
444 sectional study in the UK Biobank cohort. *J Affect Disord* **229**, 296-305 (2018).
- 445 9 Winthorst, W. H. *et al.* Self-attributed seasonality of mood and behavior: a report from the  
446 Netherlands study of depression and anxiety. *Depress Anxiety* **31**, 517-523 (2014).
- 447 10 Cepeda, M. *et al.* Seasonality of physical activity, sedentary behavior, and sleep in a middle-  
448 aged and elderly population: The Rotterdam study. *Maturitas* **110**, 41-50 (2018).
- 449 11 Miller, R. *et al.* The CIRCORT database: Reference ranges and seasonal changes in diurnal  
450 salivary cortisol derived from a meta-dataset comprised of 15 field studies.  
451 *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **73**, 16-23 (2016).
- 452 12 Davenport, E. R. *et al.* Seasonal variation in human gut microbiome composition. *PLoS One* **9**,  
453 e90731 (2014).
- 454 13 Ockene, I. S. *et al.* Seasonal variation in serum cholesterol levels: treatment implications and  
455 possible mechanisms. *Arch Intern Med* **164**, 863-870 (2004).
- 456 14 Marti-Soler, H. *et al.* Seasonality of cardiovascular risk factors: an analysis including over 230  
457 000 participants in 15 countries. *Heart* **100**, 1517-1523 (2014).
- 458 15 Llera, A., Wolfers, T., Mulders, P. & Beckmann, C. F. Inter-individual differences in human  
459 brain structure and morphology link to variation in demographics and behavior. *eLife* **8**,  
460 e44443 (2019).
- 461 16 Smith, S. M. *et al.* A positive-negative mode of population covariation links brain connectivity,  
462 demographics and behavior. *Nat Neurosci* **18**, 1565-1567 (2015).
- 463 17 Myin-Germeys, I. *et al.* Experience sampling methodology in mental health research: new  
464 insights and technical developments. *World Psychiatry* **17**, 123-132 (2018).
- 465 18 Hogenelst, K., Schoevers, R. A. & aan het Rot, M. Studying the neurobiology of human social  
466 interaction: Making the case for ecological validity. *Social Neuroscience* **10**, 219-229 (2015).
- 467 19 Fry, A. *et al.* Comparison of sociodemographic and health-related characteristics of UK  
468 Biobank participants with those of the general population. *Am J Epidemiol* **186**, 1026-1034  
469 (2017).
- 470 20 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J. & Norenzayan, A. The weirdest people in the world? *The Behavioral*  
471 *and brain sciences* **33**, 61-83; discussion 83-135 (2010).
- 472 21 Jaddoe, V. W. V. *et al.* The Generation R Study: Design and cohort profile. *European Journal of*  
473 *Epidemiology* **21**, 475 (2006).
- 474 22 Volkow, N. D. *et al.* The conception of the ABCD study: From substance use to a broad NIH  
475 collaboration. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience* **32**, 4-7 (2018).
- 476 23 Niermann, H. C. M. *et al.* The relation between infant freezing and the development of  
477 internalizing symptoms in adolescence: A prospective longitudinal study. *Dev Sci* **22**, e12763  
478 (2019).
- 479 24 Hofman, A. *et al.* The Rotterdam Study: objectives and design update. *Eur J Epidemiol* **22**, 819-  
480 829 (2007).
- 481 25 Breteler, M. & Wolf, H. The Rhineland study: a novel platform for epidemiologic research into  
482 Alzheimer disease and related disorders. *Alzheimer's & Dementia* **10** (2014).

483 26 Sudlow, C. *et al.* UK biobank: an open access resource for identifying the causes of a wide  
484 range of complex diseases of middle and old age. *PLoS Med* **12**, e1001779 (2015).  
485 27 Sowell, E. R. *et al.* Mapping cortical change across the human life span. *Nat Neurosci* **6**, 309-  
486 315 (2003).  
487 28 Utzerath, C. & Fernández, G. Shaping science for increasing interdependence and  
488 specialization. *Trends in Neurosciences* **40**, 121-124 (2017).  
489 29 Statistics Netherlands: <https://www.cbs.nl>  
490 30 Association, W. M. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for  
491 medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA* **310**, 2191-2194 (2013).  
492 31 <https://stichtingcrowdience.nl/>.  
493 32 Manders, P., Lutomski, J., Smit, C., Swinkels, D. & Zielhuis, G. The Radboud Biobank: A central  
494 facility for disease-based biobanks to optimise use and distribution of biomaterial for  
495 scientific research in the Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen. *Open Journal of*  
496 *Bioresources* **5** (2018).  
497 33 Verheul, E. R., Jacobs, B., Meijer, C., Hildebrandt, M. & de Ruiter, J. Polymorphic encryption  
498 and pseudonymisation for personalised healthcare. *IACR Cryptology ePrint Archive*, 411  
499 (2016).  
500 34 Jacobs, B. & Popma, J. Medical research, big data and the need for privacy by design. *Big Data*  
501 *& Society* **6**, 2053951718824352 (2019).  
502 35 Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., Lushene, R., Vagg, P. R. & Jacobs, G. A. State-Trait Anxiety  
503 Inventory for adults -manual. (1983).  
504 36 Cohen, S., Kamarck, T. & Mermelstein, R. A global measure of perceived stress. *J Health Soc*  
505 *Behav* **24**, 385-396 (1983).  
506 37 Bjørnskov, C. How comparable are the Gallup world poll life satisfaction data? *Journal of*  
507 *Happiness Studies* **11**, 41-60 (2010).  
508 38 Russell, D., Peplau, L. A. & Cutrona, C. E. The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: concurrent and  
509 discriminant validity evidence. *J Pers Soc Psychol* **39**, 472-480 (1980).  
510 39 Rosenberg, D. E. *et al.* Reliability and validity of the Sedentary Behavior Questionnaire (SBQ)  
511 for adults. *J Phys Act Health* **7**, 697-705 (2010).  
512 40 Buysse, D. J., Reynolds, C. F., Monk, T. H., Berman, S. R. & Kupfer, D. J. The Pittsburgh Sleep  
513 Quality Index: a new instrument for psychiatric practice and research. *Psychiatry Res* **28**, 193-  
514 213 (1989).  
515 41 <https://www.lissdata.nl/>.  
516 42 Vink, J. M., Willemsen, G., Beem, A. L. & Boomsma, D. I. The Fagerstrom test for nicotine  
517 dependence in a Dutch sample of daily smokers and ex-smokers. *Addict Behav* **30**, 575-579  
518 (2005).  
519 43 Saunders, J. B., Aasland, O. G., Babor, T. F., de la Fuente, J. R. & Grant, M. Development of the  
520 Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO collaborative project on early  
521 detection of persons with harmful alcohol consumption. *Addiction* **88**, 791-804 (1993).  
522 44 Schippers, G. M. & Broekman, T. G. MATE-Q 2.1. Handleiding. *Nijmegen: Bêta Boeken* (2014).  
523 45 Feunekes, G. I., Van Staveren, W. A., De Vries, J. H., Burema, J. & Hautvast, J. G. Relative and  
524 biomarker-based validity of a food-frequency questionnaire estimating intake of fats and  
525 cholesterol. *Am J Clin Nutr* **58**, 489-496 (1993).  
526 46 Molag, M. L. *et al.* Selecting informative food items for compiling food-frequency  
527 questionnaires: comparison of procedures. *Br J Nutr* **104**, 446-456 (2010).  
528 47 Siebelink, E., Geelen, A. & de Vries, J. H. Self-reported energy intake by FFQ compared with  
529 actual energy intake to maintain body weight in 516 adults. *Br J Nutr* **106**, 274-281 (2011).  
530 48 Verkleij-Hagoort, A. C. *et al.* Validation of the assessment of folate and vitamin B12 intake in  
531 women of reproductive age: the method of triads. *Eur J Clin Nutr* **61**, 610-615 (2007).  
532 49 Schredl, M. Reliability and stability of a dream recall frequency scale. *Percept Mot Skills* **98**,  
533 1422-1426 (2004).  
534 50 Lemmens, J. S., Valkenburg, P. M. & Gentile, D. A. The internet gaming disorder scale. *Psychol*  
535 *Assess* **27**, 567-582 (2015).  
536 51 van den Eijnden, R. J. J. M., Lemmens, J. S. & Valkenburg, P. M. The social media disorder  
537 scale. *Comput Hum Behav* **61**, 478-487 (2016).  
538 52 Baumgartner, S. E., Lemmens, J. S., Weeda, W. D. & Huizinga, M. Measuring media  
539 multitasking: development of a short measure of media multitasking for adolescents. *ournal*  
540 *of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications* **92**, 92-101 (2017).

- 541 53 Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J. & Griffin, S. The satisfaction with life scale. *J Pers*  
542 *Assess* **49**, 71-75 (1985).
- 543 54 Bohlmeijer, E., ten Klooster, P. M., Fledderus, M., Veehof, M. & Baer, R. Psychometric  
544 properties of the five facet mindfulness questionnaire in depressed adults and development  
545 of a short form. *Assessment* **18**, 308-320 (2011).
- 546 55 van Dijk, L., van der Maat, M., Salimans, R. & Bouvy, M. De balans tussen verkrijgbaarheid en  
547 veiligheid. Evaluatie van de indeling van zelfzorggeneesmiddelen en de rol van drogist en  
548 apotheek bij de verstrekking. *Nivel* (2010).
- 549 56 Yzermans, J., Baliatsas, C., van Dulmen, S. & Van Kamp, I. Assessing non-specific symptoms in  
550 epidemiological studies: Development and validation of the Symptoms and Perceptions (SaP)  
551 questionnaire. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health* **219**, 53-65 (2016).
- 552 57 Kessler, R. C. *et al.* The World Health Organization adult ADHD Self-Report Scale (ASRS): a  
553 short screening scale for use in the general population. *Psychol Med* **35**, 245-256 (2005).
- 554 58 Bralten, J. *et al.* Autism spectrum disorders and autistic traits share genetics and biology. *Mol*  
555 *Psychiatry* **23**, 1205-1212 (2018).
- 556 59 Rush, A. J., Gullion, C. M., Basco, M. R., Jarrett, R. B. & Trivedi, M. H. The Inventory of  
557 Depressive Symptomatology (IDS): psychometric properties. *Psychol Med* **26**, 477-486 (1996).
- 558 60 Rodriguez, B. F., Bruce, S. E., Pagano, M. E., Spencer, M. A. & Keller, M. B. Factor structure  
559 and stability of the Anxiety Sensitivity Index in a longitudinal study of anxiety disorder  
560 patients. *Behav Res Ther* **42**, 79-91 (2004).
- 561 61 Schaufeli, W. & Dierendonck, D. v. Utrechtse burn-out schaal: handleiding. *Amsterdam:*  
562 *Pearson Assessment and Information B.V.* (1981, 2001).
- 563 62 Cima, M., Raine, A., Meesters, C. & Popma, A. Validation of the Dutch Reactive Proactive  
564 Questionnaire (RPQ): differential correlates of reactive and proactive aggression from  
565 childhood to adulthood. *Aggress Behav* **39**, 99-113 (2013).
- 566 63 Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C. & Lazarus, R. S. Comparison of two modes of stress  
567 measurement: daily hassles and uplifts versus major life events. *J Behav Med* **4**, 1-39 (1981).
- 568 64 Garnefski, N., Kraaij, V. & Spinhoven, P. CERQ. Handleiding voor het gebruik van de Cognitive  
569 Emotion Regulation Questionnaire. *Leiderdorp: DATEC.* (2002).
- 570 65 Bernstein, D. P. *et al.* Development and validation of a brief screening version of the  
571 Childhood Trauma Questionnaire. *Child Abuse Negl* **27**, 169-190 (2003).
- 572 66 Brugha, T. S. & Cragg, D. The list of threatening experiences: the reliability and validity of a  
573 brief life events questionnaire. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* **82**, 77-81 (1990).
- 574 67 Leary, M. R. Need to belong scale. Measurement instrument database for the social science.  
575 [www.midss.ie](http://www.midss.ie) (2013).
- 576 68 Zimet, G. D., Powell, S. S., Farley, G. K., Werkman, S. & Berkoff, K. A. Psychometric  
577 characteristics of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *J Pers Assess* **55**,  
578 610-617 (1990).
- 579 69 Geurts, S. *et al.* Work-home interaction from a work psychological perspective: Development  
580 and validation of a new questionnaire, the SWING. *Work & Stress* **19** (2005).
- 581 70 Klein, H. J., Cooper, J. T., Molloy, J. C. & Swanson, J. A. The assessment of commitment:  
582 Advantages of a unidimensional, target-free approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **99**, 222-  
583 238 (2014).
- 584 71 van der Heijden, B. I. J. M. *et al.* Development and validation of the short-form employability  
585 five-factor instrument. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **106**, 236 - 248 (2018).
- 586 72 van der Heijden, B. I. Professional expertise of higher level employees; age stereotyping in  
587 self-assessments and supervisor ratings. *Tijdschr Gerontol Geriatr* **31**, 62-69 (2000).
- 588 73 van Veldhoven, M. J. P. M., Prins, J., van der Laken, P. A. & Dijkstra, L. BBA2.0: Update van de  
589 standaard voor vragenlijstonderzoek naar werk, welbevinden en prestaties. *Amsterdam: SKB*  
590 (2014).
- 591 74 Craig, S. C. Efficacy, trust, and political behavior: an attempt to resolve a lingering conceptual  
592 dilemma. *American Politics Quarterly* **7**, 225-239 (1979).
- 593 75 Kuhn, T., van Elsas, E., Hakhverdian, A. & van der Brug, W. An ever wider gap in an ever closer  
594 union: Rising inequalities and euroscepticism in 12 West European democracies, 1975–2009.  
595 *Socio-Economic Review* **14**, 27-45 (2016).
- 596 76 Costa, P. & R. McCrae, R. *The revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R)*. Vol. 2 (2008).
- 597 77 Aron, E. N., Aron, A. & Jagiellowicz, J. Sensory processing sensitivity: a review in the light of  
598 the evolution of biological responsivity. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev* **16**, 262-282 (2012).

599 78 Patton, J. H., Stanford, M. S. & Barratt, E. S. Factor structure of the Barratt impulsiveness  
600 scale. *J Clin Psychol* **51**, 768-774 (1995).

601 79 Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F. & Boone, A. L. High self-control predicts good adjustment,  
602 less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *J Pers* **72**, 271-324 (2004).

603 80 Chen, G., Gully, S. M. & Eden, D. Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational*  
604 *Research Methods* **4**, 62-83 (2001).

605 81 Seuntjens, T. G., Zeelenberg, M., van de Ven, N. & Breugelmans, S. M. Dispositional greed. *J*  
606 *Pers Soc Psychol* **108**, 917-933 (2015).

607 82 Jonason, P. K. & Webster, G. D. The dirty dozen: a concise measure of the dark triad. *Psychol*  
608 *Assess* **22**, 420-432 (2010).

609 83 Williams, G. Some determinants of the socially responsible investment decision: A cross-  
610 country study. *Journal of Behavioral Finance* **8**, 43-57 (2007).

611 84 Weller, J. A. *et al.* Development and testing of an abbreviated numeracy scale: A rasch  
612 analysis approach. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making* **26**, 198-212 (2013).

613 85 Atkinson, A. & Messy, F.-A. Assessing financial literacy in 12 countries: an OECD/INFE  
614 international pilot exercise. *Journal of Pension Economics and Finance* **10**, 657-665 (2011).

615 86 Galesic, M. & Garcia-Retamero, R. Graph literacy: A cross-cultural comparison. *Medical*  
616 *decision making* **31**, 444-457 (2011).

617 87 Thomas, D. *et al.* *Cultural intelligence: A theory-based, short form measure.* (2015).

618 88 Åstrand, P. O. & Ryhming, I. A nomogram for calculation of aerobic capacity (physical fitness)  
619 from pulse rate during sub-maximal work. *J Appl Physiol* **7**, 218-221 (1954).

620 89 Kozey-Keadle, S., Libertine, A., Lyden, K., Staudenmayer, J. & Freedson, P. S. Validation of  
621 wearable monitors for assessing sedentary behavior. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* **43**, 1561-1567  
622 (2011).

623 90 Ryan, C. G., Grant, P. M., Tigbe, W. W. & Granat, M. H. The validity and reliability of a novel  
624 activity monitor as a measure of walking. *British journal of sports medicine* **40**, 779-784  
625 (2006).

626 91 Garbarino, M., Lai, M., Bender, D., Picard, R. & Tognetti, S. Empatica E3 - A wearable wireless  
627 multi-sensor device for real-time computerized biofeedback and data acquisition. 39-42  
628 (2015).

629 92 Grillon, C., Ameli, R., Woods, S. W., Merikangas, K. & Davis, M. Fear-potentiated startle in  
630 humans: effects of anticipatory anxiety on the acoustic blink reflex. *Psychophysiology* **28**, 588-  
631 595 (1991).

632 93 Aitken, R. C. Measurement of feelings using visual analogue scales. *Proc R Soc Med* **62**, 989-  
633 993 (1969).

634 94 Shanholtzer, B. A. & Patterson, S. M. Use of bioelectrical impedance in hydration status  
635 assessment: reliability of a new tool in psychophysiology research. *Int J Psychophysiol* **49**, 217-  
636 226 (2003).

637 95 Collins, S. L., Moore, R. A. & McQuay, H. J. The visual analogue pain intensity scale: what is  
638 moderate pain in millimetres? *Pain* **72**, 95-97 (1997).

639 96 Timmerman, H., Wilder-Smith, O., van Weel, C., Wolff, A. & Vissers, K. Detecting the  
640 neuropathic pain component in the clinical setting: a study protocol for validation of  
641 screening instruments for the presence of a neuropathic pain component. *BMC Neurol* **14**, 94  
642 (2014).

643 97 Timmerman, H., Wilder-Smith, O. H., Steegers, M. A., Vissers, K. C. & Wolff, A. P. The added  
644 value of bedside examination and screening QST to improve neuropathic pain identification in  
645 patients with chronic pain. *J Pain Res* **11**, 1307-1318 (2018).

646 98 Lanier, G. M. *et al.* Validity and reliability of a novel slow cuff-deflation system for noninvasive  
647 blood pressure monitoring in patients with continuous-flow left ventricular assist device. *Circ*  
648 *Heart Fail* **6**, 1005-1012 (2013).

649 99 van Mil, A. C. *et al.* Correlation of carotid artery reactivity with cardiovascular risk factors and  
650 coronary artery vasodilator responses in asymptomatic, healthy volunteers. *J Hypertens* **35**,  
651 1026-1034 (2017).

652 100 Faith, J. J. *et al.* The long-term stability of the human gut microbiota. *Science* **341**, 1237439  
653 (2013).

654 101 Cherbuin, N., Kumar, R., Sachdev, P. S. & Anstey, K. J. Dietary mineral intake and risk of mild  
655 cognitive impairment: the PATH through life project. *Front Aging Neurosci* **6**, 4 (2014).



656 102 Schwabe, L., Haddad, L. & Schachinger, H. HPA axis activation by a socially evaluated cold-  
657 pressor test. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **33**, 890-895 (2008).

658 103 Wright, K. D., Hickman, R. & Laudenslager, M. L. Hair cortisol analysis: A promising biomarker  
659 of HPA activation in older adults. *Gerontologist* **55 Suppl 1**, S140-145 (2015).

660 104 Aerts, R. *et al.* Silicone wristband passive samplers yield highly individualized pesticide residue  
661 exposure profiles. *Environmental Science & Technology* **52**, 298-307 (2018).

662 105 O'Connell, S. G., Kincl, L. D. & Anderson, K. A. Silicone wristbands as personal passive  
663 samplers. *Environmental Science & Technology* **48**, 3327-3335 (2014).

664 106 Glasser, M. F. *et al.* The minimal preprocessing pipelines for the Human Connectome Project.  
665 *Neuroimage* **80**, 105-124 (2013).

666 107 Diaz, B. A. *et al.* The ARSQ 2.0 reveals age and personality effects on mind-wandering  
667 experiences. *Front Psychol* **5**, 271 (2014).

668 108 Marques, J. P. *et al.* MP2RAGE, a self bias-field corrected sequence for improved  
669 segmentation and T1-mapping at high field. *Neuroimage* **49**, 1271-1281 (2010).

670 109 Langkammer, C. *et al.* Quantitative susceptibility mapping (QSM) as a means to measure brain  
671 iron? A post mortem validation study. *Neuroimage* **62**, 1593-1599 (2012).

672 110 Constantino, S. M. & Daw, N. D. Learning the opportunity cost of time in a patch-foraging  
673 task. *Cogn Affect Behav Neurosci* **15**, 837-853 (2015).

674 111 Braun, A., Urai, A. E. & Donner, T. H. Adaptive history biases result from confidence-weighted  
675 accumulation of past choices. *J Neurosci* (2018).

676 112 Therrien, A. S., Wolpert, D. M. & Bastian, A. J. Effective reinforcement learning following  
677 cerebellar damage requires a balance between exploration and motor noise. *Brain* **139**, 101-  
678 114 (2016).

679 113 Persson, J., Kalpouzos, G., Nilsson, L. G., Ryberg, M. & Nyberg, L. Preserved hippocampus  
680 activation in normal aging as revealed by fMRI. *Hippocampus* **21**, 753-766 (2011).

681 114 Oosterman, J. M., Wijers, M. & Kessels, R. P. Planning or something else? Examining  
682 neuropsychological predictors of Zoo Map performance. *Appl Neuropsychol Adult* **20**, 103-109  
683 (2013).

684 115 Andreatta, M. *et al.* Initial and sustained brain responses to contextual conditioned anxiety in  
685 humans. *Cortex* **63**, 352-363 (2015).

686 116 Webb, T. L., Miles, E. & Sheeran, P. Dealing with feeling: a meta-analysis of the effectiveness  
687 of strategies derived from the process model of emotion regulation. *Psychol Bull* **138**, 775-808  
688 (2012).

689 117 Derry, P. A. & Kuiper, N. A. Schematic processing and self-reference in clinical depression. *J*  
690 *Abnorm Psychol* **90**, 286-297 (1981).

691 118 Groefsema, M., Engels, R., Kuntsche, E., Smit, K. & Luijten, M. Cognitive biases for social  
692 alcohol-related pictures and alcohol use in specific social settings: an event-level study.  
693 *Alcohol Clin Exp Res* **40**, 2001-2010 (2016).

694 119 Figner, B., Mackinlay, R. J., Wilkening, F. & Weber, E. U. Affective and deliberative processes  
695 in risky choice: age differences in risk taking in the Columbia Card Task. *J Exp Psychol Learn*  
696 *Mem Cogn* **35**, 709-730 (2009).

697 120 Veling, H. *et al.* Training impulsive choices for healthy and sustainable food. *J Exp Psychol Appl*  
698 **23**, 204-215 (2017).

699 121 Noussair, C. N., Trautmann, S. T. & van de Kuilen, G. Higher order risk attitudes,  
700 demographics, and financial decisions. *The Review of Economic Studies* **81**, 325-355 (2014).

701 122 Kerschbamer, R. The geometry of distributional preferences and a non-parametric  
702 identification approach: The Equality Equivalence Test. *European Economic Review* **76**, 85-103  
703 (2015).

704 123 Dimmock, S. G., Kouwenberg, R. & Wakker, P. P. Ambiguity attitudes in a large representative  
705 sample. *Management Science* **62**, 1363-1380 (2016).

706 124 Hergueux, J. & Jacquemet, N. Social preferences in the online laboratory: a randomized  
707 experiment. *Experimental Economics* **18**, 251-283 (2015).

708 125 Fischbacher, U., Gächter, S. & Quercia, S. The behavioral validity of the strategy method in  
709 public good experiments. *Journal of Economic Psychology* **33**, 897-913 (2012).

710 126 Falk, A. *et al.* Global evidence on economic preferences. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*  
711 **133**, 1645-1692 (2018).

712 127 Kuijpers, M., Hakemulder, F., Tan, E. & Doicaru, M. Exploring absorbing reading experiences:  
713 Developing and validating a self-report scale to measure story world absorption. *Scientific*  
714 *Study of Literature* **4** (2014).

715 128 Jasso, G. & Opp, K. D. Probing the character of norms: A factorial survey analysis of the norms  
716 of political action. *American Sociological Review* **62**, 947 (1997).

717 129 Rooks, G., Raub, W., Selten, R. & Tazelaar, F. How inter-firm co-operation depends on social  
718 embeddedness: A vignette study. *Acta Sociologica* **43**, 123-137 (2000).

719 130 Hintz, F. *et al.* Shared lexical access processes in speaking and listening? An individual  
720 differences study. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* **46**,  
721 1048–1063 (2020).

722 131 Salthouse, T. A. The processing-speed theory of adult age differences in cognition. *Psychol Rev*  
723 **103**, 403-428 (1996).

724 132 Earles, J. L. & Salthouse, T. A. Interrelations of age, health, and speed. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci*  
725 *Soc Sci* **50**, P33-p41 (1995).

726 133 Deary, I. J., Liewald, D. & Nissan, J. A free, easy-to-use, computer-based simple and four-  
727 choice reaction time programme: the Deary-Liewald reaction time task. *Behav Res Methods*  
728 **43**, 258-268 (2011).

729 134 Wechsler, D. WAIS-III (3rd edition). *Amsterdam: Harcourt Test Publishers* (2004).

730 135 Chu, M., Meyer, A., Foulkes, L. & Kita, S. Individual differences in frequency and saliency of  
731 speech-accompanying gestures: the role of cognitive abilities and empathy. *J Exp Psychol Gen*  
732 **143**, 694-709 (2014).

733 136 Berch, D. B., Krikorian, R. & Huha, E. M. The Corsi block-tapping task: methodological and  
734 theoretical considerations. *Brain Cogn* **38**, 317-338 (1998).

735 137 Raven, J., Raven, J. C. & Court, J. H. Raven manual section 4: advanced progressive matrices.  
736 *Oxford, UK: Oxford Psychologists Press* (1998).

737 138 Dunn, L. M. & Dunn, D. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (3rd Edition). *Circle Pines: American*  
738 *Guidance Service* (1997).

739 139 Schlichting, L. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Dutch-III-NL. *Amsterdam, NL: Harcourt*  
740 *Assessment BV* (2005).

741 140 Brysbaert, M., Sui, L., Dirix, N. & Hintz, F. Dutch Author Recognition Test. *J Cogn* **3**, 6-6 (2020).

742 141 Hubers, F., Snijders, T. & Hoop, H. How the brain processes violations of the grammatical  
743 norm: An fMRI study. *Brain and Language* **163**, 22-31 (2016).

744 142 Shao, Z., Janse, E., Visser, K. & Meyer, A. S. What do verbal fluency tasks measure? Predictors  
745 of verbal fluency performance in older adults. *Frontiers in psychology* **5**, 772-772 (2014).

746 143 Mainz, N., Shao, Z., Brysbaert, M. & Meyer, A. S. Vocabulary knowledge predicts lexical  
747 processing: Evidence from a group of participants with diverse educational backgrounds.  
748 *Front Psychol* **8**, 1164 (2017).

749 144 Jongman, S., Khoe, Y. & Hintz, F. Vocabulary size influences spontaneous speech in native  
750 language users: validating the use of automatic speech recognition in individual differences  
751 research. *Language and Speech*, 002383092091107 (2020).

752 145 Huettig, F. & Janse, E. Individual differences in working memory and processing speed predict  
753 anticipatory spoken language processing in the visual world. *Language, Cognition and*  
754 *Neuroscience* **31**, 80-93 (2016).

755 146 Altmann, G. T. M. & Kamide, Y. Incremental interpretation at verbs: restricting the domain of  
756 subsequent reference. *Cognition* **73**, 247-264 (1999).

757 147 Hintz, F., Meyer, A. S. & Huettig, F. Predictors of verb-mediated anticipatory eye movements  
758 in the visual world. *J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn* **43**, 1352-1374 (2017).

759 148 Kahneman, D. & Deaton, A. High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-  
760 being. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **107**, 16489-16493 (2010).

761 149 Biswas, A. *et al.* Sedentary time and its association with risk for disease incidence, mortality,  
762 and hospitalization in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* **162**,  
763 123-132 (2015).

764 150 Ekelund, U. *et al.* Does physical activity attenuate, or even eliminate, the detrimental  
765 association of sitting time with mortality? A harmonised meta-analysis of data from more  
766 than 1 million men and women. *The Lancet* **388**, 1302-1310 (2016).

767 151 Diaz, K. M. *et al.* Patterns of sedentary behavior and mortality in U.S. middle-aged and older  
768 adults: a national cohort study. *Ann Intern Med* **167**, 465-475 (2017).

769 152 ten Broeke, P. *et al.* Temporal dynamics of sitting behavior at work. *Proceedings of the*  
 770 *National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 14883-14889 (2020).  
 771 153 den Broeder, L., Devilee, J., van Oers, H., Schuit, A. J. & Wagemakers, A. Citizen science for  
 772 public health. *Health Promotion International* **33**, 505-514 (2016).  
 773 154 Bevelander, K. E. *et al.* Crowdsourcing novel childhood predictors of adult obesity. *PLOS ONE*  
 774 **9**, e87756 (2014).  
 775 155 Bongard, J., Hines, P., Conger, D., Hurd, P. & Lu, Z. Crowdsourcing predictors of behavioral  
 776 outcomes. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics Part A: Systems and Humans*  
 777 **43** (2012).  
 778 156 Wang, C. *et al.* Crowdsourcing in health and medical research: a systematic review. *Infect Dis*  
 779 *Poverty* **9**, 8 (2020).  
 780 157 Mount, M., Round, H. & Pitsis, T. S. Design thinking inspired crowdsourcing: Toward a  
 781 generative model of complex problem solving. *California Management Review* **62**, 103-120  
 782 (2020).  
 783 158 Van Essen, D. C. *et al.* The Human Connectome Project: a data acquisition perspective.  
 784 *Neuroimage* **62**, 2222-2231 (2012).  
 785 159 Miller, K. L. *et al.* Multimodal population brain imaging in the UK Biobank prospective  
 786 epidemiological study. *Nat Neurosci* **19**, 1523-1536 (2016).  
 787 160 Bloem, B. R. *et al.* The Personalized Parkinson Project: examining disease progression through  
 788 broad biomarkers in early Parkinson's disease. *BMC Neurol* **19**, 160 (2019).  
 789

790 **Acknowledgement**

791 The HBS is funded by the Reinier Post Foundation and Radboud University, Nijmegen, the  
 792 Netherlands.

793 The HBS consortium consists of:

Last name	First name	Email address	Affiliation
Aarts	Esther	esther.aarts@donders.ru.nl	1
Akkerman	Agnes	a.akkerman@fm.ru.nl	2
Altgassen	Mareike	aaltgass@uni-mainz.de	3
Bartels	Ronald	ronald.bartels@radboudumc.nl	4
Beckers	Debby	d.beckers@psych.ru.nl	5
Bevelander	Kirsten	kris.bevelander@radboudumc.nl	4
Bijleveld	Erik	e.bijleveld@psych.ru.nl	5
Blaney Davidson	Esmeralda	esmeralda.blaneydavidson@radboudumc.nl	4
Boleij	Annemarie	annemarie.boleij@radboudumc.nl	4
Bralten	Janita	janita.bralten@radboudumc.nl	4
Cillessen	Toon	a.cillessen@psych.ru.nl	5
Claassen	Jurgen	jurgen.claassen@radboudumc.nl	4
Cools	Roshan	r.cools@donders.ru.nl	6
Cornelissen	Ineke	ineke.cornelissen@radboudumc.nl	4
Dresler	Martin	martin.dresler@donders.ru.nl	6
Eijsvogels	Thijs	thijs.eijsvogels@radboudumc.nl	4
Faber	Myrthe	m.faber@donders.ru.nl	6
Fernández	Guillén	g.fernandez@donders.ru.nl	6
Figner	Bernd	b.figner@psych.ru.nl	1-5
Fritsche	Matthias	m.fritsche@donders.ru.nl	1
Füllbrunn	Sascha	s.fullbrunn@fm.ru.nl	2
Gayet	Surya	s.gayet@donders.ru.nl	1
Gelder, van	Marleen M.H.J.	marleen.vangelder@radboudumc.nl	4
Gerven, van	Marcel	marcel.vangerven@donders.ru.nl	1
Geurts	Sabine	s.geurts@psych.ru.nl	5
Greven	Corina U.	c.greven@donders.ru.nl	6
Groefsema	Martine	m.groefsema@pwo.ru.nl	5
Haak	Koen	k.haak@donders.ru.nl	6
Hagoort	Peter	peter.hagoort@mpi.nl	1-7
Hartman	Yvonne	yvonne.hartman@radboudumc.nl	4

Heijden, van der	Beatrice	b.vanderheijden@fm.ru.nl	2
Hermans	Erno	erno.hermans@donders.ru.nl	6
Heuvelmans	Vivian	vivian.heuvelmans@radboudumc.nl	4
Hintz	Florian	florian.hintz@mpi.nl	7
Hollander, den	Janet	janet.denhollander@radboudumc.nl	4
Hulsman	Anneloes M.	a.hulsman@donders.ru.nl	1-5
Idesis	Sebastian	sebastian.idesis@upf.edu	8
Jaeger	Martin	martin.jaeger@radboudumc.nl	4
Janse	Esther	e.janse@let.ru.nl	9
Janzing	Joost	joost.janzing@radboudumc.nl	4
Kessels	Roy P.C.	r.kessels@donders.ru.nl	1-6
Kleijn, de	Willemien	w.dekleijn@psych.ru.nl	10
Klein	Marieke	marieke.klein@radboudumc.nl	4
Klumpers	Floris	f.klumpers@donders.ru.nl	1-5
Kohn	Nils	n.kohn@donders.ru.nl	6
Korzilius	Hubert	h.korzilius@fm.ru.nl	2
Krahmer	Bas	b1.krahmer@student.ru.nl	4
Lange, de	Floris	f.delange@donders.ru.nl	1
Leeuwen, van	Judith	j.vanleeuwen@donders.ru.nl	6
Liu	Huaiyu	l.huaiyu@psych.ru.nl	5
Luijten	Maartje	m.luijten@bsi.ru.nl	5
Manders	Peggy	peggy.manders@radboudumc.nl	4
Manevska	Katerina	k.manevska@fm.ru.nl	2
Marques	José P.	j.marques@donders.ru.nl	1
Matthews	Jon	jon.matthews@radboudumc.nl	6
McQueen	James M.	j.mcqueen@donders.ru.nl	1
Medendorp	Pieter	p.medendorp@donders.ru.nl	1
Melis	René	Rene.Melis@radboudumc.nl	4
Meyer	Antje	antje.meyer@mpi.nl	7
Oosterman	Joukje	j.oosterman@donders.ru.nl	1
Overbeek	Lucy	lucy.overbeek@radboudumc.nl	4
Peelen	Marius	m.peelen@donders.ru.nl	1
Popma	Jean	j.popma@ru.nl	11
Postma	Geert	g.j.postma@science.ru.nl	12
Roelofs	Karin	k.roelofs@donders.ru.nl	1-5
Rossenbergh, van	Yvonne G.T.	y.vanrossenbergh@fm.ru.nl	2
Schaap	Gabi	g.schaap@maw.ru.nl	5

Scheepers	Paul	paul.scheepers@radboudumc.nl	4
Selen	Luc	l.selen@donders.ru.nl	1
Starren	Marianne	m.starren@let.ru.nl	9
Swinkels	Dorine W.	dorine.swinkels@radboudumc.nl	4
Tendolkar	Indira	indira.tendolkar@radboudumc.nl	6
Thijssen	Dick	dick.thijssen@radboudumc.nl	4
Timmerman	Hans	h.timmerman02@umcg.nl	13
Tutunji	Rayyan	r.toutounji@donders.ru.nl	6
Tuladhar	Anil	anil.tuladhar@radboudumc.nl	6
Veling	Harm	h.veling@psych.ru.nl	5
Verhagen	Maike	m.verhagen@pwo.ru.nl	5
Verkroost	Jasper	jasper.verkroost@radboudumc.nl	4
Vriezeekolk	Vivian	vivian.vriezeekolk@radboudumc.nl	4
Vrijzen	Janna	janna.vrijzen@radboudumc.nl	6
Vyrastekova	Jana	j.vyrastekova@fm.ru.nl	2
Wal, van der	Selina	selina.vanderWal@radboudumc.nl	4
Willems	Roel	r.willems@donders.ru.nl	1-9
Willemsen	Arthur	arthur.willemsen@radboudumc.nl	4

794

795 Affiliations:

- 796 1 Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behavior, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The  
797 Netherlands
- 798 2 Insitute for Management Research, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
- 799 3 Johannes Gutenberg-University Mainz, Germany
- 800 4 Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
- 801 5 Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
- 802 6 Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behavior, Radboud University Medical Center,  
803 Nijmegen, The Netherlands
- 804 7 Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
- 805 8 Center for Brain and Cognition, University Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
- 806 9 Centre for Language Studies, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

807	10	School of Psychology and Artificial Intelligence, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the
808		Netherlands
809	11	Interdisciplinary Hub for Security, Privacy and Data Governance, Radboud University,
810		Nijmegen, the Netherlands
811	12	Institute for Molecules and Materials, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands
812	13	University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands