


## Supplemental Material



**Supplemental Figure 1.** Anatomical connections between taste and food reward circuitry based on Rolls et al. 2010 and Lechan and Toni 2000.

Rolls ET. The affective and cognitive processing of touch, oral texture, and temperature in the brain. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2010;34(2):237-45. Epub 2008/05/13. doi: S0149-7634(08)00046-8 [pii] 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.03.010. PubMed PMID: 18468687.

Lechan RM, Toni R. Functional Anatomy of the Hypothalamus and Pituitary. In: De Groot LJ, Beck-Peccoz P, Chrousos G, Dungan K, Grossman A, Hershman JM, et al., editors. Endotext. South Dartmouth (MA)2000.

### Movement Parameters:


All subjects' movements of the head during fMRI were within the 1-voxel threshold and no subject was removed. Movement parameters were included in the preprocessing analysis. There were no statistical differences between movement parameters between groups (Supplemental Table 1) and no subject exceeded movement of one voxel (3mm).

Movement	HC		AN		BN		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
X translation	-0.17776	0.67373	-0.03708	0.43703	0.08163	0.63373	1.185	0.312
Y translation	0.31773	0.39516	0.49457	0.31240	0.47708	0.29853	2.086	0.132
Z translation	0.10157	1.12886	-0.43239	1.15919	-0.20124	1.17117	1.378	0.259
Roll rotation	0.00374	0.02032	0.01046	0.02221	0.00381	0.01762	0.905	0.409
Pitch rotation	-0.00397	0.01644	0.00109	0.01226	-0.00196	0.01176	0.875	0.421
Yaw rotation	-0.00002	0.00641	0.00030	0.00613	0.00091	0.00867	0.108	0.898

Supplemental Table 1. Movement parameters across groups.

## fMRI Main Effects and Comparison Between Groups

fMRI contrast main effect data for the contrast Receiving Sucrose vs. Receiving No Solution per ROI were also extracted and compared across groups. The data were non-normally distributed, therefore rank transformed and analyzed by group including the same cofactors as in the analysis of connectivity strength. The multivariate Wilks' Lambda for group effect was 0.390,  $p < 0.986$ ; individual group effects by region were non significant.



**Supplemental Figure 2.** Graphical representation of main effect parameter estimates by group and region of interest for the contrast receiving sucrose vs. receiving no solution.

