

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Obesity and Insulin Resistance Alter Neural Processing of Unpleasant, but Not Pleasant, Visual Stimuli in Young Adults

[Brittany A. Larsen](#) , Brandon S. Klinedinst , Tovah Wolf , [Kelsey E. McLimans](#) , Qian Wang , Parvin Mohammadiarvekeh , [Mohammad Fili](#) , [Azizi Seixas](#) , [Auriel A. Willette](#) *

Posted Date: 24 November 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202511.1821.v1

Keywords: electroencephalography (EEG); emotion; event-related potentials (ERPs); insulin resistance; neurophysiology; obesity



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Obesity and Insulin Resistance Alter Neural Processing of Unpleasant, but Not Pleasant, Visual Stimuli in Young Adults

Brittany A. Larsen ¹, Brandon S. Klinedinst ², Tovah Wolf ³, Kelsey E. McLimans ⁴, Qian Wang ⁵, Parvin Mohammadiarvekeh ⁶, Mohammad Fili ⁷, Azizi Seixas ^{1,8} and Auriel A. Willette ^{2,*}

¹ 1120 NW 14th St., Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, Florida, USA 33136

² 125 Paterson St., Department of Neurology, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA 08901

³ 1699 W Mound St., Lifecare Alliance, Columbus, Ohio, USA 43223

⁴ 900 Viterbo Dr., Nutrition and Dietetics Department, Viterbo University, La Crosse, Wisconsin, USA 54601

⁵ 2312 Food Sciences Building, 536 Farm House Ln., Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition, College of Human Sciences, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, USA 50011

⁶ 6116 Executive Blvd., University of Maryland Institute for Health Computing, North Bethesda, Maryland, USA 20852

⁷ 201 Advanced Technology Research Center, College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology, School of Industrial Engineering and Management, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA 74078

⁸ 1120 NW 14th St., Department of Informatics and Health Data Science, University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, Miami, Florida, USA 33136

* Correspondence: auriel.a.willette@rutgers.edu; Tel: +1 (848) 932-8413

Abstract

Background/Objectives: Obesity and insulin resistance (IR) increase the risk for mood disorders, which often manifest during young adulthood. However, neuroelectrophysiological investigations of whether adiposity and/or IR modify electrocortical activity and emotional processing outcomes remain underexplored, particularly in younger adults. Therefore, this study used electroencephalography (EEG) to investigate whether obesity and/or IR moderated the relationships between brain potentials and affective processing in younger adults. **Methods:** Thirty younger adults completed a passive picture-viewing task utilizing the International Affective Picture System while real-time electroencephalography was recorded. Two event-related potentials—early posterior negativity (EPN) and late positive potential (LPP)—were quantified. Affective processing parameters included mean valence ratings and stimulus-to-response-onset reaction times in response to unpleasant, pleasant, and neutral images. Body fat percentage and Homeostatic Model Assessment for Insulin Resistance values were measured. Hierarchical moderated regression analysis was utilized to test the interrelationships between brain potentials, adiposity, IR, and affective processing. **Results:** In the Negative–Neutral condition, lean and insulin-sensitive participants gave less negative valence ratings to unpleasant versus neutral images when late-window LPP amplitudes were larger, whereas respective counterparts showed no such relationship. Contrariwise, neither obesity nor IR moderated LPP responses to affective processing parameters in the Positive–Neutral or Negative–Positive conditions. **Conclusions:** Lean, insulin-sensitive young adults showed attenuated affective processing of unpleasant stimuli through stronger neural responses, whereas neural responses to pleasant stimuli did not vary across levels of body fat or IR. These preliminary findings suggest that both obesity and IR increase the vulnerability to mood disorders in young adulthood.

Keywords: electroencephalography (EEG); emotion; event-related potentials (ERPs); insulin resistance; neurophysiology; obesity

1. Introduction

Global adult obesity rates have more than doubled from 7% in 1990 to 16% in 2022 [1]. Obesity has been associated with an increased risk for mood disorders [2,3], which are often characterized by alterations in emotional processing [4] and most commonly manifest during young adulthood [5]. Similarly, obesity is linked to alterations in affective processing, namely enhanced automatic negative affective processing (i.e., more difficulties in suppressing the automatic processing of information associated with negative emotions [6–8]) and, to a lesser extent, attenuated automatic positive affective processing (i.e., diminished automatic processing of information associated with positive emotions [9]). In contrast to these findings, however, an exploratory meta-analysis comprised of 13 studies reported that emotional processing was not significantly impaired in those with obesity compared to controls, but this meta-analysis included studies that were comprised of participants across all age groups [10]. A preliminary study also did not find a deficit in affective processing among young preadolescents and adolescents with obesity, although this study did not include young adults [11]. Hence, evidence of whether obesity influences affective processing in young adults remains inconsistent in the prevailing body of literature. However, considering that global rates of mental disorders have increased, especially mood disorders [12], it is crucial to clarify whether modifiable risk factors such as excess adiposity is associated with deficits in affective processing, particularly in an age group when such disorders are most likely to emerge.

Additionally, insulin resistance (IR) is also a risk factor for mood disorders [13,14]. Insulin, a pancreatic hormone, functions in whole-body glycolytic processes [15]. IR emerges when target tissues are less responsive to insulin stimulation [16]. Although IR has also been consistently correlated with more emotional processing impairments in children [17], younger adult females with polycystic ovary syndrome [18], and male mice [19], work investigating the relationship between IR and affective processing impairments among otherwise healthy younger adults remains underexplored and, therefore, also warrants investigation in this population.

Neurophysiologically, affective processing neurocircuitry involves widespread brain regions. Affective processing commences with an automatic, nonconscious response to an emotional stimulus that is signaled by increased amygdala activity [20]. Information about emotional arousal is subsequently relayed from the amygdala and basal ganglia to the ventrolateral prefrontal cortex (vlPFC), anterior insula, supplementary motor area, angular gyrus, and superior temporal gyrus. The former two regions evaluate the affective input to determine whether the affective arousal necessitates emotional regulation, while the lattermost three regions respectively simulate the motor, somatosensory, and language processes associated with the affective input to enhance an emotional experience. If regulation is required, the vlPFC and anterior insula further project this information to the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC), where affect regulation occurs (i.e., downregulation of Negatively-valenced stimuli and/or upregulation of Positively-valenced stimuli). Subsequently, the dlPFC projects a feedforward signal directly or through the anterior middle cingulate gyrus back to the amygdala, basal ganglia, supplementary motor area, as well as the angular and superior temporal gyri, which, in turn, contribute to the production of a newly-regulated emotional state [21].

Obesity and IR may impair affective processing by inducing brain structural and functional alterations in regions that modulate affective processing. For example, greater adiposity has been linked to fewer dopamine striatal D2 receptors [22], which, in turn, associates with impaired prefrontal metabolism within the orbitofrontal and anterior cingulate cortices in those with obesity [23]. These neural modifications may reduce prefrontal modulation of affective input from the amygdala and basal ganglia, resulting in amplified responses to unpleasant stimuli and consequent enhanced negative affective processing. Furthermore, considering that antagonistic action against dopamine D2/D3 receptors has been found to attenuate striatal activity in response to rewarding stimuli [24], this may partially explain why blunted positive affective processing has also been found in these subjects [9]. Additionally, a neuroimaging study observed blunted activity in the amygdalae

of subjects with obesity, which was linked to a greater susceptibility to feelings of negative affectivity, particularly fear [25]. IR is also correlated with brain structural and functional alterations. Peripheral IR impedes central signaling, causing central IR [26] and hindering brain glucose metabolism. Chronic central IR engenders progressive brain atrophy [27]. IR-induced atrophy is most pronounced in brain structures that function in affective processing/regulation (e.g., prefrontal cortices, medial temporal lobe, parietal gyri [28]), which may consequently impede emotional processing function over time. Central IR has also been associated with impediments in dopamine turnover and mitochondrial dysfunction, which, in turn, was related to a higher risk of mood disorders [29]. These findings collectively suggest that impairments in affective processing among those with obesity and/or IR may be partially attributed to the diminished top-down modulation of affectivity due to obesity-/IR-linked brain structural and functional impairments.

The prevailing empirical evidence has most frequently utilized functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) to investigate if obesity and/or IR associates with deficits [32–35] in neural activity and underlying affective processing [17,18,25,30,31]. Although electroencephalography (EEG) has been used extensively in studies of emotional processing (e.g., [32–35]), neuroelectrophysiological investigations of whether adiposity and IR influence brain function and affective processing outcomes are remarkably underexplored to date. The limited evidence that has investigated this, however, focused on older adults [36], leaving these interrelationships unexplored in younger adults. Yet, considering that young adulthood is the most frequent period for the onset of mood disorders [37], further exploration of how risk factors may be related to alterations in not just hemodynamic but also electrophysiological properties of brain function and emotional processing outcomes is crucial in this age group. Such electrophysiological properties of brain function can be captured by EEG. During a task, electrical activity recorded by EEG is utilized to quantify event-related potentials (ERPs), which are voltage fluctuations captured by an electroencephalogram that are induced by a particular event or stimulus [38]. Each ERP component is functionally differentiated according to: 1) polarity (direction of amplitude deflection); 2) scalp distribution; 3) latency (time and duration of electrocortical activity); and 4) sensitivity to particular task-linked manipulations [39].

Two ERP components—early posterior negativity (EPN) and late positive potential (LPP)—index affective processing [40]. EPN is a negative, occipitotemporal potential with an electrocortical activity trough approximately 200–300 milliseconds (ms) post-stimulus exposure. Larger (i.e., more negative) EPN voltage amplitudes reflect an increase in postsynaptic potentials in the extrastriate visual cortex [41] and indicate elevated automatic, nonconscious, visual attention to and sensory processing of emotional stimuli [42]. EPN is particularly sensitive to Positively-valenced stimuli [43]. LPP is a positive, centroparietal potential that commences 300–400 ms post-stimulus exposure [44,45]. Higher (i.e., more positive) LPP voltage amplitudes reflect an increase in prolonged postsynaptic potentials in the parietal and prefrontal cortices [46], and amplitude deflections are consistently higher in response to emotional versus neutral stimuli [47,48]. As LPP amplitudes are generally sustained throughout the continuance of stimulus presentation [44], LPP is often segmented into three distinctive latency windows that represent neural responses during three sequential affective processing stages: 1) automatic emotional response; 2) sustained attention to and ongoing evaluation of emotional stimuli; and 3) prolonged affective processing, affect regulation, and possibly memory encoding [40,49–54]. LPP amplitudes in the early latency window peak in the centroparietal area [54–56] and functionally index emotional salience in terms of motivated attention during passive picture-viewing tasks, with amplitudes reflecting the level of arousal elicited by emotional stimuli [49,50,54]. In contrast, LPP amplitudes during the later latency windows shift to a frontal distribution [54–56] and reflect greater processing of as well as sustained attention to affective stimuli relative to neutral during passive picture-viewing tasks [50,51,54]. Late-window LPP amplitudes may also be more sensitive to valence-specific differentiation compared to the early-window LPP [57]. As such, individuals with obesity and IR would be expected to have higher late-window LPP amplitudes and enhanced affective processing in response to unpleasant stimuli as well as lower late-window LPP

amplitudes and attenuated affective processing in response to pleasant stimuli compared to lean and insulin-sensitive individuals, respectively.

Nevertheless, no studies to date have used EEG to investigate whether the relationships between brain function and negative or positive affective processing may differ by levels of body fat and IR in younger adults. To help fill these gaps, this study aimed to investigate whether obesity and/or IR moderate the links between brain potentials and underlying negative and/or positive affective processing parameters in younger adults. The central hypotheses were: 1) younger adults without obesity or IR will show attenuated negative affective processing through lower late-window LPP amplitudes in response to unpleasant stimuli compared to respective counterparts; and 2) young adults without obesity or IR will show enhanced positive affective processing through higher late-window LPP amplitudes in response to pleasant stimuli compared to respective counterparts.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Participants

Although 60 younger adults between 18–39 years of age who inhabited the Ames, Iowa, USA location were invited to participate, attrition ($n=24$) and missing ($n=5$) or excessively noisy ($n=1$) EEG data resulted in the inclusion of 30 participants in the final analyses. Consequently, statistical power was evaluated using G*power (version 3.1.9.7; Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany) for each moderation model that was found to have a significant interaction term, which will be described alongside each significant model in the Results section.

Inclusion criteria were:

1. aged 18–39 years; and
2. overnight fasting capability (no more than 16 consecutive hours).

Exclusion criteria were:

1. cerebrovascular/neurological diseases (e.g., stroke, multiple sclerosis, traumatic brain injury, cerebral hematoma);
2. major cardiovascular events;
3. major psychiatric disorders (e.g., major depressive disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, schizophrenia, autism spectrum disorders, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, bipolar disorder);
4. recent drug, alcohol, or substance abuse (≤ 6 months);
5. diabetes mellitus I/II;
6. blood pressure $\geq 21.3/14.7$ kPa ($\geq 160/110$ mmHg);
7. fasting blood glucose values of <3.9 mmol/L (<70 mg/dL) or >6.9 mmol/L (>125 mg/dL);
8. current use of medications that impact weight, insulin levels, serum biomarkers, or affective processing (e.g., systemic corticosteroids, weight reduction medications, atypical antipsychotics);
9. have ferrous metal implants or shrapnel around the head/eyes;
10. currently pregnant; and/or
11. currently use nicotine/tobacco products.

Approval from the Iowa State University Institutional Review Board was obtained.

2.2. Study Design and Protocol

To investigate if obesity and/or IR moderated brain potentials and affective processing, a cross-sectional, observational design was utilized. Study visits included an initial screening and two follow-up visits within a one-month timeframe.

2.2.1. Initial Screening Visit

Each potential participant had the consent form thoroughly explained, with signatures obtained during the initial screening visit prior to commencing with any study procedures. Subsequently, the medical history of each potential subject was thoroughly queried. Additionally, height and weight were obtained.

2.2.2. First Follow-Up Visit

During the first follow-up visit, height and weight were reobtained, and each participant's body fat percentage (BF%) was measured by a dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry scan (DEXA/DXA; Hologic Discovery v.12.3, Hologic, Inc., Marlborough, Massachusetts, USA). Fasting blood serum was collected, from which fasting glucose and insulin values were quantified. Utilizing these values, IR was gauged for each participant in accordance with the Homeostatic Model Assessment for Insulin Resistance (HOMA-IR) formula: $(\text{fasting glucose (mmol/L)} * \text{fasting insulin (pmol/L)})/22.5$ (or $(\text{glucose (mg/dL)} * \text{insulin (}\mu\text{IU/mL)})/405$ for conventional units) [58]. Physical activity levels were self-reported as part of the body composition analysis and categorized as: 1) sedentary (no engagement in physical activity beyond basic movements from daily life); 2) low active (<150 (moderate) or <75 (vigorous) minutes of activity weekly); 3) active (150–300 (moderate) or 75–150 (vigorous) minutes of activity per week); or 4) very active (>300 (moderate) or >150 (vigorous) minutes of weekly activity [59]). Participants were subsequently dichotomized via whether physical activity levels totaled <150 (moderate) or <75 (vigorous) minutes weekly (sedentary/low active) versus ≥ 150 (moderate) or ≥ 75 (vigorous) minutes weekly (active/very active), as done previously [60].

2.2.3. Second Follow-Up Visit

Subjects completed the International Affective Picture System (IAPS) task [61] while brain activity was concomitantly recorded via EEG during the second follow-up visit. Participants were singly shown 64 randomized neutral ($n=21$), unpleasant ($n=22$), and pleasant ($n=21$) images for two seconds each, then instructed to rate the magnitude of pleasantness or unpleasantness of each image (i.e., valence ratings), where 1="very positive," 2="somewhat positive," 3="somewhat negative," and 4="very negative." Unpleasant and pleasant images were matched for normative arousal ratings to ensure that differences in neural responses were attributable to valence rather than arousal. The task photo identification numbers used in this study are listed in **Table A.1**. IAPS task parameters were scored in E-Prime*3 [62].

Affective processing parameters included the mean valence ratings (an indicator of the magnitude of negativity or positivity felt in response to unpleasant or pleasant visual stimuli, respectively [63]) of and stimulus-to-response-onset reaction times (RTs, which reflect affective processing and attentional engagement [64] and are sensitive to valence-specific differentiation [65]) to unpleasant, pleasant, and neutral images. As done in prior work [66–69], in order to optimally gauge valence-specific affective processing, the scores of each emotionally-valenced condition (i.e., negative, positive) were subsequently compared to the scores of the control (i.e., Neutrally-valenced) or oppositely-valenced conditions as follows: 1) Negative minus Neutral; 2) Positive minus Neutral; and 3) Negative minus Positive. However, because valence ratings reflect opposite degrees of unpleasantness or pleasantness for emotionally-valenced pictures, the calculation for the mean valence rating scores in the oppositely-valenced contrast condition (i.e., Negative minus Positive) was accordingly adjusted as: Negative minus (4 – Positive). For the contrasted valence ratings, larger difference scores for the contrasted Negatively-valenced conditions indicate more unpleasant ratings assigned to the visual stimuli overall, whereas larger difference scores for the contrasted Positively-valenced condition reflect more pleasant ratings assigned to the visual stimuli overall. In addition, for the mean stimulus-to-response-onset RTs, difference scores with negative values represent faster RTs to the emotional condition versus the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition, whereas difference scores with positive values instead reflect faster RTs to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition.

2.3. Electroencephalography

As described previously [60], EEG was recorded using an electrode array cap comprised of 64 Ag/AgCl electrodes (Sands Research, El Paso, Texas, USA), in alignment with the standards defined by the 10-10 International System of electrode placement, and was interfaced to a digital bio-potential amplifier (DBPA-1; Sensorium Inc., Charlotte, Vermont, USA). A sampling rate of 2,048 Hz was used. Utilizing EEGlab (Version 2021.1 [70]) in MatLab (Version R2022a, MathWorks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, USA), the EEG preprocessing procedure included:

1. application of a high-pass (≤ 0.1 Hz) filter followed by a low-pass (≥ 30 Hz) filter (using gain 1,000, 16-bit A/D conversion);
2. continuous EEG data was epoched into two-second segments post-stimulus onset (0–2.0 second latency window);
3. standardized the whole-brain amplitude values via average reference computation;
4. eliminated noisy channels through an automatic epoch rejection method (channel fluctuations $\geq 1,000$ μ V);
5. computed an Independent Component Analysis (ICA) using the Multiple Artifact Rejection Algorithm (MARA) toolbox [71,72];
6. eliminated artifacts using a peer-reviewed algorithm and statistical parameters [73]; and
7. exported the whole time-course grand means for each valence condition to a .csv file.

2.4. Event-Related Potential Components

Grand-mean averaged waveforms were utilized to quantify the EPN and LPP components as follows:

1. EPN: six occipitotemporal electrodes (O1/2, PO7/8, P7/8; [74,75]) between 200–280 ms post-stimulus exposure [76,77]; and
2. LPP: ten centroparietal electrodes (CPz, CP1/2, CP3/4, Pz, P1/2, P3/4; [78,79]) across three latency windows, defined as the early (400–800 ms), middle (800–1,200 ms), and late (1,200–2,000 ms) windows [80,81].

To serve as ERP indices of valence-specific affective processing, EPN and LPP amplitudes of each emotionally-valenced condition (i.e., negative, positive) were then compared to the amplitudes of the control (i.e., Neutrally-valenced) or oppositely-valenced conditions as follows [66–69]:

1. Negative–Neutral;
2. Positive–Neutral; and
3. Negative–Positive.

For the EPN component, lower difference score values reflect overall larger amplitude deflections in response to the emotionally-valenced condition compared to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition, whereas higher difference scores indicate overall larger amplitude deflections in response to the emotionally-valenced condition compared to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition for the LPP component.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

Participants were stratified into two separate groups based on BF% (lean ($n=8$) versus obese ($n=22$)) and HOMA-IR (insulin-sensitive ($n=18$) versus insulin-resistant ($n=12$)) values to assess between-group differences. Lean versus obese were respectively defined as a BF% of $<25\%$ (males) and $<35\%$ (females) versus $\geq 25\%$ (males) and $\geq 35\%$ (females) [82]. As previously recommended [83,84], HOMA-IR values of <2.0 versus ≥ 2.0 defined insulin sensitivity versus IR, respectively. Statistical comparisons of participant characteristics were conducted using chi-square, Fisher's exact, or independent-samples t-tests in SPSS Statistics (Version 31.0.0.0; IBM Corp., Armonk, New York, USA). Significance was set at $p \leq 0.05$ for group comparisons.

Hierarchical moderated regression analyses tested whether obesity and/or IR moderated the relationships between brain potentials and affective processing utilizing the PROCESS macro for SPSS (Version 5.0 [85]). All continuous variables were mean-centered prior to analysis to eliminate multicollinearity issues. A multiple imputations procedure in SPSS was applied to impute missing affective processing parameters ($n=2$). The first step of each moderation model tested whether the predictor and moderator variables independently accounted for a significant proportion of the variance for the outcome variable. For each contrasted valence condition, the first step included a predictor (EPN, LPP voltage amplitudes), a moderator (BF%, HOMA-IR), an outcome variable (valence ratings, RTs), and all significant ($p\leq 0.10$) covariates (age, physical activity, racial/ethnic group, sex). In the second step, each moderation model was retested after the addition of the interaction term (predictor*moderator), with all covariates readded. In both steps, each non-significant covariate was singly eliminated from each model in descending order of significance. The Bonferroni correction was applied to correct for multiple comparison of associations, in which $p\leq 0.0063$ was considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Participant Characteristics

As delineated in **Table 1**, demographic and clinical characteristics were compared between stratified adiposity (lean versus obese) and IR (insulin-sensitive versus insulin-resistant) groups. In summary, subjects with obesity and IR had more insulin dysregulation compared to respective counterparts. Additionally, subjects with obesity showed greater glucose dysregulation. Finally, subjects with IR participated in less weekly physical activity and had higher BF% and diastolic blood pressure.

Table 1. Participant characteristic comparisons by adiposity and insulin groups.

Data (unit)	Adiposity				Insulin		
	Total (n=30)	Lean (n=8)	Obese (n=22)	t value/Chi-square	Insulin-sensitive (n=18)	Insulin-resistant (n=12)	t value/Chi-square
Age (years)	25.7 (5.3)	23.3 (4.1)	26.5 (5.5)	$t = -1.54$	24.9 (5.6)	26.8 (4.9)	$t = -0.98$
Sex (n females (%))	15 (50.0%)	3 (37.5%)	12 (54.5%)	$\chi^2 = 0.68$	8 (44.4%)	7 (58.3%)	$\chi^2 = 0.56$
Activity Level (n (%))				$\chi^2 = 4.18$			$\chi^2 = 5.63^*$
Sedentary/Low	20	3	17		9 (50.0%)	11	
Active	(66.7%)	(37.5%)	(77.3%)			(91.7%)	
Active/Very	10	5	5		9 (50.0%)	1 (8.3%)	
Active	(33.3%)	(62.5%)	(22.7%)				
Race/Ethnicity (n (%))				$\chi^2 = 3.62$			$\chi^2 = 5.17$
White	24 (80.0%)	5 (62.5%)	19 (86.4%)		13 (72.2%)	11 (91.7%)	
Asian	5 (16.7%)	3 (37.5%)	2 (9.1%)		5 (27.8%)	0 (0.0%)	

Hispanic/Latinx	1 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.5%)		0 (0.0%)	1 (8.3%)	
Black	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)		0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
BF% (DEXA)	37.1 (10.3)	24.8 (4.7)	41.6 (7.9)	$t = -5.64^{***}$	31.6 (8.5)	45.5 (6.7)	$t = -4.76^{***}$
BMI	29.3 (8.2)	21.0 (1.6)	32.2 (7.5)	$t = -6.94^{***}$	24.5 (5.3)	36.4 (6.4)	$t = -5.74^{***}$
BP, diastolic (kPa)	10.2 (1.7)	9.6 (2.0)	10.5 (1.5)	$t = -1.26$	9.7 (1.6)	11.1 (1.4)	$t = -2.33^*$
BP, systolic (kPa)	16.2 (2.1)	16.6 (2.8)	16.0 (1.7)	$t = 0.68$	16.0 (2.4)	16.6 (1.3)	$t = -0.75$
Glucose (mmol/L), fasting	5.0 (0.5)	4.7 (0.4)	5.1 (0.4)	$t = -2.38^*$	4.9 (0.5)	5.2 (0.5)	$t = -1.50$
Height (meters)	1.7 (0.1)	1.8 (0.1)	1.7 (0.1)	$t = 0.43$	1.7 (0.1)	1.7 (0.1)	$t = -0.37$
Hemoglobin A1c (%)	5.4 (0.2)	5.3 (0.1)	5.4 (0.2)	$t = -1.05$	5.3 (0.2)	5.4 (0.2)	$t = -1.36$
HOMA-IR	2.6 (2.5)	0.9 (0.3)	3.3 (2.7)	$t = -4.24^{***}$	1.2 (0.4)	4.9 (2.8)	$t = -8.07^{***}$

Values are Mean (Standard Deviation) unless otherwise indicated. BF% = body fat percentage; BMI = body mass index; BP=Blood pressure; DEXA = dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; hemoglobin A1c = glycated hemoglobin; HOMA-IR = homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance. * and *** = $p \leq 0.05$ and ≤ 0.005 , respectively. For the stratified adiposity groups, t -values, chi-square, and Fisher's exact values reflect differences between participants with and without obesity based on a body fat percentage of $\geq 25\%$ (males) and $\geq 35\%$ (females) versus $< 25\%$ (males) and $< 35\%$ (females), respectively. For the stratified insulin groups, t -values, chi-square, and Fisher's exact values reflect differences between participants with insulin resistance and insulin sensitivity based on HOMA-IR values of ≥ 2.0 versus < 2.0 , respectively.

3.2. Event-Related Potentials.

EPN and LPP grand-mean averaged waveforms across the sample are illustrated for each valence condition in **Figures 1a–b**. For EPN (**Figure 1a**), Positively-valenced images elicited the largest (i.e., most negative) amplitudes, while Negatively-valenced images evoked the smallest. For LPP (**Figure 1b**), Negatively-valenced pictures generated the largest (i.e., most positive) amplitudes across all latency windows, while Positively-valenced pictures evoked the smallest during the early latency window and Neutrally-valenced pictures evoked the smallest during the later latency windows.




Figure 1. Line graphs depict the grand-mean averaged EPN (a) and LPP (b) waveforms across all participants after viewing Negatively- (red), Neutrally- (green), and Positively-valenced (blue) pictures during an International Affective Picture System task. Amplitude was measured in microvolts (μV); time was measured in milliseconds. EPN = early posterior negativity; LPP = late positive potential; ms = milliseconds. Early, middle, and late latency windows of the LPP component = 400–800 ms, 800–1,200 ms, and 1,200–2,000 ms post-stimulus onset, respectively.


3.3. Neural Amplitudes by Categorical Groups

Table 2 presents the comparisons of the differenced grand-mean averaged EPN and LPP waveforms in each contrasted picture condition (i.e., Negative minus Neutral, Positive minus Neutral, and Negative minus Positive) by stratified adiposity (also see **Figure 2a–f** (differenced waveforms) and **Supplementary Figure S1a–f** (non-differenced waveforms for each separate valence condition)) and IR levels (also see **Figure 3a–f** (differenced waveforms) and **Supplementary Figure S2a–f** (non-differenced waveforms for each separate valence condition)). Concisely, participants without obesity or IR elicited higher LPP amplitudes during the late latency window in response to unpleasant versus neutral pictures than did lean or insulin-sensitive counterparts, respectively (see **Figures 2b/Supplementary Figure 1b** and **3b/Supplementary Figure 2b**). Furthermore, participants with obesity evoked larger LPP amplitudes during the early latency window in the contrasted Negative–Positive valence condition (see **Figure 2f/Supplementary Figure 1f**).


Table 2. Comparisons of event-related potentials by adiposity and insulin groups.

ERP Components	Adiposity			t value	Insulin			
	Total	Lean	Obese		Insulin- sensitive	Insulin- resistant	t value	
Negative–Neutral								
EPN	1.7 (2.7)	1.7 (3.0)	1.6 (2.6)	t= 0.04	1.1 (2.6)	2.5 (2.6)	t= -1.37	
Early LPP	0.9 (1.9)	0.6 (2.5)	1.1 (1.7)	t= - 0.64	0.8 (2.1)	1.2 (1.7)	t= -0.47	
Middle LPP	0.8 (2.2)	0.6 (2.2)	0.9 (2.2)	t= - 0.38	0.7 (2.1)	1.1 (2.4)	t= -0.45	
Late LPP	1.2 (1.8)	2.4 (2.3)	0.8 (1.5)	t= 2.31*	1.8 (1.9)	0.3 (1.3)	t= 2.37*	
Positive–Neutral								
EPN	-0.3 (2.6)	-0.7 (2.1)	-0.2 (2.8)	t= - 0.49	-0.8 (2.5)	0.4 (2.6)	t= -1.22	
Early LPP	-0.1 (2.3)	0.6 (1.7)	-0.3 (2.5)	t= 0.96	0.0 (2.3)	-0.2 (2.5)	t= 0.26	
Middle LPP	0.1 (2.7)	0.3 (2.0)	0.1 (2.9)	t= 0.17	0.2 (2.5)	0.0 (3.1)	t= 0.13	
Late LPP	0.7 (2.2)	1.9 (2.1)	0.3 (2.2)	t= 1.87	1.2 (1.9)	-0.1 (2.6)	t= 1.69	
Negative–Positive								
EPN	2.0 (2.7)	2.4 (3.1)	1.8 (2.6)	t= 0.50	1.9 (2.9)	2.1 (2.5)	t= -0.18	
Early LPP	1.0 (1.6)	0.0 (1.6)	1.4 (1.4)	t= - 2.38*	0.8 (1.7)	1.3 (1.4)	t= -0.97	
Middle LPP	0.7 (2.0)	0.3 (1.2)	0.9 (2.2)	t= - 0.65	0.5 (1.9)	1.0 (2.2)	t= -0.68	
Late LPP	0.5 (2.0)	0.5 (2.0)	0.5 (2.0)	t= 0.03	0.6 (2.0)	0.4 (2.0)	t= 0.19	


Values are Mean (Standard Deviation) unless otherwise indicated. Amplitude was measured in microvolts (μV). EPN = early posterior negativity; ERP = event-related potential; LPP = late positive potential. * = p≤0.05. In each contrasted valence condition, the mean ERP amplitudes of a Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition were subtracted from the mean ERP amplitudes of an emotionally-valenced condition (i.e., negative or positive) as follows: 1) Negative–Neutral; 2) Positive–Neutral; and 3) Negative–Positive. For the EPN component, lower difference score values reflect overall larger amplitude deflections in response to the emotionally-valenced condition compared to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition, whereas higher difference scores indicate overall larger amplitude deflections in response to the emotionally-valenced condition compared to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition for the LPP component. Early, middle, and late latency windows of the LPP component = 400–800 ms, 800–1,200 ms, and 1,200–2,000 ms post-stimulus onset, respectively. For the stratified adiposity groups, t-values reflect differences between participants with and without obesity based on a body fat percentage of ≥25% (males) and ≥35% (females) versus <25% (males) and <35% (females), respectively. For the stratified insulin groups, t-values reflect differences between participants with insulin resistance and insulin sensitivity based on HOMA-IR values of ≥2.0 versus <2.0, respectively.




(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)







Figure 2. Line graphs show the comparisons of the differenced grand-mean averaged EPN (left) and LPP (right) waveforms in the contrasted picture conditions (i.e., Negative minus Neutral (a–b), Positive minus Neutral (c–d), and Negative minus Positive (e–f) EPN and LPP waveforms) between lean (body fat percentage of <25% (males) and <35% (females), in blue) versus obese (body fat percentage of ≥25% (males) and ≥35% (females), in red) subjects. Amplitude was measured in microvolts (μV); time was measured in milliseconds. EPN = early posterior negativity; LPP = late positive potential; ms = milliseconds. Early, middle, and late latency windows of the LPP component = 400–800 ms, 800–1,200 ms, and 1,200–2,000 ms post-stimulus onset, respectively. For the EPN component, lower difference score values reflect overall larger amplitude deflections in response to the emotionally-valenced condition compared to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition, whereas higher difference scores indicate overall larger amplitude deflections in response to the emotionally-valenced condition compared to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition for the LPP component.







(b)



(c)



(d)



(e)




Figure 3. Line graphs show the comparisons of the differenced grand-mean averaged EPN (left) and LPP (right) waveforms in the contrasted picture conditions (i.e., Negative minus Neutral (a–b), Positive minus Neutral (c–d), and Negative minus Positive (e–f) EPN and LPP waveforms) between insulin-sensitive (HOMA-IR values of <2.0, in blue) versus insulin-resistant (HOMA-IR values of ≥2.0, in red) subjects. Amplitude was measured in microvolts (µV); time was measured in milliseconds. EPN = early posterior negativity; IR = insulin-resistant; IS = insulin-sensitive; LPP = late positive potential; ms = milliseconds. Early, middle, and late latency windows of the LPP component = 400–800 ms, 800–1,200 ms, and 1,200–2,000 ms post-stimulus onset, respectively. For the EPN component, lower difference score values reflect overall larger amplitude deflections in response to the emotionally-valenced condition compared to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition, whereas higher difference scores indicate overall larger amplitude deflections in response to the emotionally-valenced condition compared to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition for the LPP component.

3.4. Affective Processing Parameters by Categorical Groups

Differences in affective processing parameters were assessed by stratified adiposity and IR groups for each contrasted valence condition (see **Table 3**). In summary, participants with IR had slower RTs in response to unpleasant versus neutral images compared to insulin-sensitive subjects. Additionally, participants with obesity gave overall higher (i.e., more negative) valence ratings to emotional pictures in the contrasted Negative–Positive valence condition.

Table 3. Comparisons of affective processing task scores by adiposity and insulin groups.

Affective Processing Parameters		Adiposity			Insulin			
		Total	Lean	Obese	t value	Insulin Sensitive	Insulin Resistant	t value
Rating	(Negative–Neutral)	1.6 (0.4)	1.5 (0.5)	1.6 (0.3)	$t = -0.37$	1.6 (0.4)	1.5 (0.3)	$t = 0.57$
RT	(Negative–Neutral)	2.6 (206.1)	-1.3 (154.2)	4.0 (225.2)	$t = -0.06$	-59.0 (182.9)	95.0 (211.6)	$t = -2.12^*$
Rating	(Positive–Neutral)	-0.4 (0.2)	-0.5 (0.2)	-0.4 (0.2)	$t = -1.26$	-0.5 (0.2)	-0.3 (0.2)	$t = -0.91$

RT (Positive–Neutral)	25.5	58.9	13.4	t=	7.8	52.1	t= -
	(174.4)	(213.0)	(162.2)	0.63	(213.8)	(91.1)	0.78
Rating (Negative–Positive)	2.7 (0.2)	2.5 (0.3)	2.7 (0.2)	t= - 2.39*	2.6 (0.2)	2.8 (0.2)	t= - 1.64
RT (Negative–Positive)	-17.8	-30.8	-13.0	t= -	-53.7	36.2	t= -
	(216.8)	(156.0)	(238.2)	0.20	(184.3)	(257.3)	1.12

Values are Mean (Standard Deviation) unless otherwise indicated. Reaction time was measured in milliseconds. RT = reaction time. * = $p \leq 0.05$. In each contrasted valence condition, the affective processing parameters of a Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition were subtracted from the affective processing parameters of an emotionally-valenced condition (i.e., negative or positive) as follows: 1) Negative–Neutral; 2) Positive–Neutral; and 3) Negative–Positive. For the contrasted oppositely-valenced picture condition, valence ratings were calculated as: Negative–(4–Positive). For the contrasted valence ratings, larger difference scores for the contrasted Negatively-valenced conditions indicate more unpleasant ratings assigned to the visual stimuli overall, whereas larger difference scores for the contrasted Positively-valenced condition reflect more pleasant ratings assigned to the visual stimuli overall. In addition, for the mean stimulus-to-response-onset RTs, difference scores with negative values represent faster RTs to the emotional condition versus the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition, whereas difference scores with positive values instead reflect faster RTs to the Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition. For the stratified adiposity groups, t-values reflect differences between participants with and without obesity based on a body fat percentage of $\geq 25\%$ (males) and $\geq 35\%$ (females) versus $< 25\%$ (males) and $< 35\%$ (females), respectively. For the stratified insulin groups, t-values reflect differences between participants with insulin resistance and insulin sensitivity based on HOMA-IR values of ≥ 2.0 versus < 2.0 , respectively. 3.5. Neural Amplitudes and Affective Processing.

Table 4 displays the correlation matrix between the ERPs and affective processing parameters in each contrasted condition. Succinctly, EPN amplitudes negatively correlated with RTs in the Negative–Positive condition, where greater amplitudes were linked to more negative valence ratings of unpleasant pictures relative to pleasant. Notably, across all contrasted valence conditions, LPP amplitudes during the late latency window were consistently inversely associated with mean valence ratings, suggesting that higher late-window LPP amplitudes were correlated with less overall negative (for the Negative–Neutral and Negative–Positive conditions) and more overall positive (for the Positive–Neutral condition) valence ratings; however, none of these inverse associations reached statistical significance.

Table 4. Correlation matrix of event-related potentials and affective processing parameters.

ERP Components	Negative–Neutral		Positive–Neutral		Negative–Positive	
	Valence	Reaction	Valence	Reaction	Valence	Reaction
	Rating	Time	Rating	Time	Rating	Time
Negative–Neutral						
EPN	-0.15	0.11	-	-	-	-
Early LPP	0.08	0.08	-	-	-	-
Middle LPP	-0.01	0.16	-	-	-	-
Late LPP	-0.36	0.06	-	-	-	-
Positive–Neutral						
EPN	-	-	-0.27	0.15	-	-
Early LPP	-	-	-0.06	0.09	-	-

<i>Middle LPP</i>	-	-	-0.04	0.14	-	-
<i>Late LPP</i>	-	-	-0.31	0.01	-	-
Negative–Positive						
<i>EPN</i>	-	-	-	-	0.19	-0.38*
<i>Early LPP</i>	-	-	-	-	0.28	-0.19
<i>Middle LPP</i>	-	-	-	-	0.31	-0.08
<i>Late LPP</i>	-	-	-	-	-0.08	-0.15

Values show bivariate Pearson correlation coefficients between the independent variables (EPN and LPP amplitude deflections) and the dependent variables (valence ratings, reaction times) for each contrasted condition of the International Affective Picture System task. Amplitude was measured in microvolts (μV); reaction time was measured in milliseconds. EPN = early posterior negativity; ERP = event-related potential; LPP = late positive potential. * = $p \leq 0.05$. In each contrasted valence condition, the mean ERP voltage amplitudes and affective processing parameters of a Neutrally- or oppositely-valenced condition were subtracted from the mean ERP amplitudes and affective processing parameters of an emotionally-valenced condition (i.e., negative or positive) as follows: 1) Negative–Neutral; 2) Positive–Neutral; and 3) Negative–Positive. For the contrasted oppositely-valenced picture condition, valence ratings were calculated as: Negative–(4–Positive). Early, middle, and late LPP latency windows = 400–800 ms, 800–1,200 ms, and 1,200–2,000 ms post-stimulus onset, respectively.

3.6. Moderation Analyses

3.6.1. Negative–Neutral Picture Condition

The results of how BF% and HOMA-IR values moderated the relationships between neural activity and affective processing scores in response to unpleasant versus neutral pictures are shown in **Table 5** for valence ratings and in **Table 6** for RTs. Further slope analyses in **Figures 4a–b** illustrate that, exclusively in participants with low BF% and low-to-medium HOMA-IR values, greater LPP amplitudes during the late latency window were associated with less negative valence ratings in response to unpleasant pictures relative to neutral pictures. However, considering the smaller sample size, two post hoc power analyses were conducted to evaluate the statistical power of both models with significant interactions. Using a linear multiple regression, fixed model, R^2 increase statistical approach, with $N=30$, calculated effect sizes of Cohen’s $f^2=0.3933$ (for the late LPP*BF% interaction) and 0.3802 (for the late LPP*HOMA-IR interaction), $\alpha=0.0063$ (Bonferroni corrected p-value), and the inclusion of 3 predictors (1 tested predictor [interaction term], the independent variable, and the moderator), the statistical power was determined to be 67.5% for the late LPP*BF% interaction model and 65.6% for the late LPP*HOMA-IR interaction model when predicting mean valence ratings in the contrasted Negative–Neutral valence condition. Although this statistical power is modest and does not meet the standard 80% power threshold, these results nonetheless provide meaningful preliminary evidence. The observed large effect sizes in the interaction models ($f^2 \approx 0.38–0.39$) suggest that the detected associations are unlikely to be artifacts of insufficient power alone. Thus, while these findings should be interpreted with appropriate caution, these preliminary results nonetheless remain informative and warrant further investigation in larger samples.

Table 5. Hierarchical moderated regression results for Negative vs. Neutral valence ratings.

Variables	Step 1					Step 2				
	β	t	R^2	F	p	β	t	ΔR^2	ΔF	p
Model 1			0.03	0.47	0.63			0.03	0.30	0.82
<i>EPN</i>	-0.15	-0.79				-0.15	-0.78			
<i>BF%</i>	0.10	0.53				0.10	0.52			

EPN*BF%						0.02	0.10	0.00	0.01	0.92
Model 2			0.02	0.33	0.73			0.02	0.21	0.89
EPN	-0.15	-0.81				-0.15	-0.77			
HOMA-IR	-0.01	-0.06				-0.01	-0.07			
EPN*HOMA-IR						0.02	0.09	0.00	0.01	0.93
Model 3			0.02	0.28	0.76			0.03	0.24	0.87
eLPP	0.10	0.51				0.11	0.57			
BF%	0.12	0.62				0.13	0.67			
eLPP*BF%						0.08	0.40	0.00	0.16	0.69
Model 4			0.01	0.09	0.91			0.01	0.10	0.96
eLPP	0.08	0.43				0.09	0.46			
HOMA-IR	0.00	-0.01				-0.01	-0.05			
eLPP*HOMA-IR						0.07	0.36	0.01	0.13	0.73
Model 5			0.01	0.16	0.86			0.06	0.53	0.66
mLPP	-0.02	-0.10				0.00	0.01			
BF%	0.11	0.56				0.15	0.76			
mLPP*BF%						0.22	1.13	0.05	1.28	0.27
Model 6			0.00	0.00	1.00			0.06	0.55	0.65
mLPP	-0.01	-0.06				-0.04	-0.21			
HOMA-IR	0.01	0.03				-0.09	-0.42			
mLPP*HOMA-IR						0.26	1.29	0.06	1.65	0.21
Model 7			0.13	2.06	0.15			0.38**	5.25**	0.006
ILPP	-0.38	-1.94				-0.05	-0.24			
BF%	-0.06	-0.28				-0.08	-0.46			
ILPP*BF%						0.60***	3.20***	0.24***	10.23***	0.004
Model 8			0.14	2.20	0.13			0.38**	5.29**	0.006
ILPP	-0.40	-2.12				-0.20	-1.18			
HOMA-IR	-0.12	-0.63				-0.11	-0.69			
ILPP*HOMA-IR						0.52***	3.14***	0.24***	9.89***	0.004

Table displays the results of each step of the hierarchical moderated regression analyses, which tested whether EPN or LPP voltage amplitudes and BF% or HOMA-IR moderated the mean valence ratings after viewing Negatively-valenced versus Neutrally-valenced pictures. BF% = body fat percentage; eLPP = late positive potential in the early latency window; EPN = early posterior negativity; HOMA-IR = homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance; ILPP = late positive potential in the late latency window; mLPP = late positive potential in the middle latency window. ** and *** = $p \leq 0.0063$ and ≤ 0.005 , respectively. β shows standardized regression coefficients. Only statistically significant covariates ($p \leq 0.10$) were included in each model.


Table 6. Hierarchical moderated regression results for Negative vs. Neutral reaction times.

Variables	Step 1					Step 2				
	β	t	R^2	F	p	β	t	ΔR^2	ΔF	p
Model 1			0.14	1.38	0.27			0.16	1.17	0.35

<i>EPN</i>	0.10	0.56				0.12	0.64			
<i>BF%</i>	0.02	0.09				0.02	0.10			
<i>Age</i>	0.35	1.90				0.36	1.95			
<i>EPN*BF%</i>						-	-0.78	0.02	0.61	0.44
						0.15				
Model 2			0.15	2.37	0.11			0.25	2.05	0.12
<i>EPN</i>	0.15	0.85				0.11	0.63			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.37	2.08				0.32	1.76			
<i>Age</i>						0.32	1.73			
<i>EPN*HOM</i>						-	-0.86	0.02	0.75	0.40
<i>A-IR</i>						0.16				
Model 3			0.16	1.65	0.20			0.16	1.19	0.34
<i>eLPP</i>	0.19	1.00				0.18	0.93			
<i>BF%</i>	0.03	0.16				0.02	0.13			
<i>Age</i>	0.40	2.14				0.40	2.10			
<i>eLPP*BF%</i>						-	-0.12	0.00	0.01	0.91
						0.02				
Model 4			0.32	2.91	0.04			0.32	2.91	0.04
<i>eLPP</i>	0.11	0.61				0.12	0.69			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.38	2.09				0.30	1.75			
<i>Age</i>	0.32	1.79				0.36	2.02			
<i>Race/Ethnici</i>	0.32	1.83								
<i>ty</i>										
<i>eLPP*HOM</i>						-	-1.84	0.09	3.38	0.08
<i>A-IR</i>						0.31				
Model 5			0.18	1.93	0.15			0.19	1.42	0.26
<i>mLPP</i>	0.24	1.32				0.23	1.26			
<i>BF%</i>	-0.01	-0.07				-	-0.13			
						0.02				
<i>Age</i>	0.41	2.21				0.41	2.19			
<i>mLPP*BF%</i>						-	-0.33	0.00	0.11	0.74
						0.06				
Model 6			0.34	3.22	0.03			0.38	2.88	0.04
<i>mLPP</i>	0.19	1.11				0.22	1.30			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.37	2.05				0.42	2.29			
<i>Age</i>	0.33	1.92				0.38	2.15			
<i>Race/Ethnici</i>	0.33	1.93				0.31	1.81			
<i>ty</i>										
<i>mLPP*HOM</i>						-	-1.17	0.04	1.36	0.26
<i>A-IR</i>						0.21				
Model 7			0.24	1.95	0.13			0.36	2.74	0.04
<i>lLPP</i>	0.31	1.42				0.09	0.40			

BF%	0.25	1.13			0.28	1.39			
Age	0.37	2.11			0.39	2.34			
Race/Ethnicity	0.37	1.79			0.42	2.15			
ILPP*BF%					-	-2.18	0.13	4.75	0.04
					0.44				
Model 8			0.44*	4.92**	0.00		0.56*	6.04*	<0.00
			**	*	5		**	**	1
ILPP	0.43	2.44			0.28	1.63			
HOMA-IR	0.59*	3.28*			0.58	3.52*			
	**	**			***	**			
Age	0.29	1.91			0.28	2.02			
Race/Ethnicity	0.52	2.97			0.49	3.07*			
ILPP*HOM					-	-2.52	0.12	6.33	0.02
A-IR					0.37				

Table displays the results of each step of the hierarchical moderated regression analyses, which tested whether EPN or LPP voltage amplitudes and BF% or HOMA-IR moderated the mean reaction times after viewing Negatively-valenced versus Neutrally-valenced pictures. BF% = body fat percentage; eLPP = early latency late positive potential; EPN = early posterior negativity; HOMA-IR = homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance; ILPP = late latency late positive potential; mLPP = middle latency late positive potential. ** and *** = $p \leq 0.0063$ and ≤ 0.005 , respectively. β shows standardized regression coefficients. Only statistically significant covariates ($p \leq 0.10$) were included in each model.






Figure 4. Interaction plots depict how body fat percentage (a) and HOMA-IR (b) moderated the relationships between the voltage amplitudes of the LPP component during the late latency window and mean valence ratings in the contrasted Negative–Neutral picture condition. Predictor (late-window LPP component voltage amplitudes) and moderator (BF%, HOMA-IR values) variables were tested as continuous variables but are shown as tertiles for visualization. BF% = body fat percentage; HOMA-IR = homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance; LPP = late positive potential; ms = milliseconds. * and *** = $p \leq 0.05$ and ≤ 0.005 , respectively. Amplitude deflections (lesser, average, greater) and BF% or HOMA-IR levels (low, medium, high) respectively reflect values at the 16th, 50th, and 84th percentiles of the total sample. Valence ratings represent the mean ratings of the magnitude of pleasantness or unpleasantness of images for each valence condition, where 1=“very positive,” 2=“somewhat positive,” 3=“somewhat negative,” and 4=“very negative,” which were subsequently contrasted as the difference between the mean valence ratings of Neutrally-valenced pictures from the mean valence ratings of Negatively-valenced pictures (i.e., Negative minus Neutral valence ratings). For the contrasted valence ratings, larger difference scores for the contrasted Negatively-valenced conditions indicate more unpleasant ratings assigned to the visual stimuli overall. For the LPP component, higher difference scores indicate overall larger amplitude deflections in response to unpleasant pictures compared to neutral pictures. For subjects with low BF% and low-to-medium HOMA-IR values, greater (i.e., more positive) LPP amplitudes during the late latency window were linked to less negative valence ratings in response to unpleasant versus neutral pictures. Early, middle, and late latency windows of the LPP component = 400–800 ms, 800–1,200 ms, and 1,200–2,000 ms, respectively.

3.6.2. Positive–Neutral Picture Condition

Tables 7 and 8 present the results of the moderation analyses for predicting valence ratings and RTs, respectively, in the Positive–Neutral trials. Contrary to what was anticipated, BF% and IR were not found to moderate the links between EPN or LPP amplitudes across any of the latency windows and affective processing scores for pleasant versus neutral stimuli.

Table 7. Hierarchical moderated regression results for Positive vs. Neutral valence ratings.

Variables	Step 1					Step 2				
	β	t	R^2	F	p	β	t	ΔR^2	ΔF	p
Model 1			0.44**	6.82**	0.00			0.44**	4.99**	0.00

			*	*	2		*	*	4
EPN	-0.27	-1.85				-0.29	-1.87		
BF%	0.32	2.11				0.32	2.05		
Race/Ethnicit	0.62**	4.02**				0.61**	3.91**		
y	*	*				*	*		
EPN*BF%						0.06	0.41	0.00	0.17
			0.41**	6.03**	0.00				0.68
Model 2			*	*	3			0.41	4.38
									8
EPN	-0.32	-2.10				-0.32	-2.07		
HOMA-IR	0.27	1.70				0.27	1.66		
Race/Ethnicit	0.61**	3.84**				0.61**	3.72**		
y	*	*				*	*		
EPN*HOMA						0.04	0.29		
-IR								0.00	0.08
			0.45**	5.09**	0.00				0.78
Model 3			*	*	4			0.45	3.91
									0.01
eLPP	-0.15	-0.93				-0.15	-0.86		
BF%	0.32	1.99				0.32	1.94		
Age	-0.28	-1.85				-0.28	-1.82		
Race/Ethnicit	0.62**	3.99**				0.62**	3.91**		
y	*	*				*	*		
eLPP*BF%						0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.00
									0.99
Model 4			0.43**	4.65**	0.00			0.43	3.57
					6				0.02
eLPP	-0.23	-1.46				-0.23	-1.39		
HOMA-IR	0.28	1.68				0.28	1.64		
Age	-0.32	-2.00				-0.32	-1.96		
Race/Ethnicit	0.64**	3.90**				0.64**	3.81**		
y	*	*				*	*		
eLPP*HOMA						0.01	0.04		
-IR								0.00	0.00
			0.45**	5.01**	0.00				0.97
Model 5			*	*	4			0.46	4.01
									9
mLPP	-0.12	-0.81				0.04	0.23		
BF%	0.35	2.24				0.51	2.55		
Age	-0.27	-1.78							
Race/Ethnicit	0.62**	3.97**				0.67**	4.13**		
y	*	*				*	*		
Physical						0.36	1.81		
Activity									
mLPP*BF%						-0.17	-1.00	0.02	1.00
									0.33
Model 6			0.32	4.11	0.02			0.48	3.48
									0.01

<i>mLPP</i>	-0.17	-1.10				0.03	0.17		
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.29	1.76				0.46	2.32		
<i>Age</i>	-0.29	-1.83							
<i>Race/Ethnicit</i>	0.62**	3.77**				0.76**	4.24**		
<i>y</i>	*	*				*	*		
<i>Physical</i>						0.39	1.94		
<i>Activity</i>									
<i>Sex</i>						-0.33	-1.91		
<i>mLPP*HOM</i>						-0.25	-1.44	0.05	2.08
<i>A-IR</i>									0.16
Model 7			0.54**	5.59**	0.00			0.54**	4.56**
			*	*	1			*	4
<i>ILPP</i>	-0.29	-1.76				-0.31	-1.81		
<i>BF%</i>	0.42	2.25				0.39	1.99		
<i>Age</i>	-0.29	-1.94				-0.28	-1.85		
<i>Physical</i>	0.30	1.76				0.32	1.79		
<i>Activity</i>									
<i>Race/Ethnicit</i>	0.61**	4.00**				0.59**	3.72**		
<i>y</i>	*	*				*	*		
<i>ILPP*BF%</i>						0.08	0.52	0.01	0.27
Model 8			0.47**	5.46**	0.00				0.61
			*	*	3			0.47	4.24
<i>ILPP</i>	-0.32	-2.03				-0.30	-1.80		
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.21	1.30				0.22	1.32		
<i>Age</i>	-0.35	-2.24				-0.35	-2.22		
<i>Race/Ethnicit</i>	0.54**	3.44**				0.54**	3.39**		
<i>y</i>	*	*				*	*		
<i>ILPP*HOMA</i>						-0.05	-0.35		0.73
<i>-IR</i>								0.00	0.12

Table displays the results of each step of the hierarchical moderated regression analyses, which tested whether EPN or LPP voltage amplitudes and BF% or HOMA-IR moderated the mean valence ratings after viewing Positively-valenced versus Neutrally-valenced pictures. BF% = body fat percentage; eLPP = early latency late positive potential; EPN = early posterior negativity; HOMA-IR = homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance; ILPP = late latency late positive potential; mLPP = middle latency late positive potential. ** and *** = $p \leq 0.0063$ and ≤ 0.005 , respectively. β shows standardized regression coefficients. Only statistically significant covariates ($p \leq 0.10$) were included in each model.

Table 8. Hierarchical moderated regression results for Positive vs. Neutral reaction times.

Variables	Step 1					Step 2				
	β	<i>t</i>	R^2	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	β	<i>t</i>	ΔR^2	ΔF	<i>p</i>
Model 1			0.04	0.39	0.76			0.10	0.96	0.43
<i>EPN</i>	0.15	0.77				0.21	1.08			
<i>BF%</i>	-0.09	-0.47				-0.08	-0.44			

<i>EPN*BF%</i>						-0.27	-1.41	0.07	2.00	0.17
Model 2			0.03	0.37	0.70			0.04	0.37	0.78
<i>EPN</i>	0.16	0.82				0.16	0.84			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	-0.07	-0.36				-0.07	-0.35			
<i>EPN*HOMA-IR</i>						-0.12	-0.62	0.01	0.38	0.54
Model 3			0.01	0.18	0.84			0.01	0.12	0.95
<i>eLPP</i>	0.07	0.33				0.06	0.28			
<i>BF%</i>	-0.07	-0.35				-0.07	-0.35			
<i>eLPP*BF%</i>						0.02	0.09	0.00	0.01	0.93
Model 4			0.01	0.13	0.88			0.03	0.22	0.88
<i>eLPP</i>	0.09	0.44				0.12	0.58			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	-0.03	-0.18				-0.04	-0.23			
<i>eLPP*HOMA-IR</i>						-0.13	-0.65	0.02	0.42	0.53
Model 5			0.03	0.35	0.71			0.04	0.32	0.81
<i>mLPP</i>	0.13	0.67				0.16	0.79			
<i>BF%</i>	-0.07	-0.39				-0.10	-0.48			
<i>mLPP*BF%</i>						-0.11	-0.52	0.01	0.27	0.61
Model 6			0.02	0.30	0.74			0.07	0.62	0.61
<i>mLPP</i>	0.14	0.73				0.21	1.06			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	-0.04	-0.22				0.00	0.00			
<i>mLPP*HOMA-IR</i>						-0.23	-1.12	0.05	1.26	0.27
Model 7			0.01	0.13	0.86			0.02	0.13	0.94
<i>lLPP</i>	-0.03	-0.16				-0.05	-0.23			
<i>BF%</i>	-0.11	-0.51				-0.13	-0.60			
<i>lLPP*BF%</i>						0.08	0.38	0.01	0.14	0.71
Model 8			0.00	0.03	0.97			0.01	0.08	0.97
<i>lLPP</i>	0.00	0.00				0.03	0.14			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	-0.05	-0.24				-0.03	-0.17			
<i>lLPP*HOMA-IR</i>						-0.09	-0.42	0.01	0.18	0.67

Table displays the results of each step of the hierarchical moderated regression analyses, which tested whether EPN or LPP voltage amplitudes and BF% or HOMA-IR moderated the mean reaction times after viewing Positively-valenced versus Neutrally-valenced pictures. BF% = body fat percentage; eLPP = early latency late positive potential; EPN = early posterior negativity; HOMA-IR = homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance; lLPP = late latency late positive potential; mLPP = middle latency late positive potential. β shows standardized regression coefficients. Only statistically significant covariates ($p \leq 0.10$) were included in each model.

3.6.3. Negative–Positive Picture Condition

Results of the moderation analyses are displayed in **Table 9** for valence ratings and **Table 10** for RTs in the Negative–Positive condition. In contrast with what was hypothesized, BF% and IR did not moderate the links between EPN or LPP amplitudes during any of the latency windows and affective processing parameters for unpleasant stimuli relative to pleasant.

Table 9. Hierarchical moderated regression results for Negative vs. Positive valence ratings.

Variables	Step 1					Step 2				
	β	t	R^2	F	p	β	t	ΔR^2	ΔF	p
Model 1			0.41***	5.96***	0.003			0.43**	4.74**	0.006
EPN	0.34	2.09				0.30	1.84			
BF%	0.35	2.23				0.37	2.33			
Race/Ethnicity	-0.42	-2.51				-	-			
						0.36	1.98			
EPN*BF%						0.17	1.02	0.02	1.04	0.32
Model 2			0.35	4.68	0.01			0.40	4.20	0.01
EPN	0.41	2.41				0.46	2.71			
HOMA-IR	0.25	1.51				0.25	1.54			
Race/Ethnicity	-0.47	-2.67				-	-			
						0.40	2.29			
EPN*HOMA-IR						0.25	1.47	0.05	2.15	0.16
Model 3			0.32	4.07	0.02			0.24	2.77	0.06
eLPP	0.12	0.68				0.14	0.74			
BF%	0.61**	3.02**				0.43	2.36			
Physical Activity	0.33	1.72								
eLPP*BF%						0.02	0.13	0.00	0.02	0.89
Model 4			0.26	3.04	0.05			0.27	2.36	0.08
eLPP	0.15	0.83				0.10	0.52			
HOMA-IR	0.22	1.24				0.28	1.40			
Sex	-0.36	-2.08				-	-			
						0.38	2.14			
eLPP*HOMA-IR						-	-	0.01	0.50	0.49
						0.14	0.71			
Model 5			0.03	0.12	0.99			0.31	3.97	0.02
mLPP	0.18	1.07				0.17	1.00			
BF%	0.60**	3.06**				0.38	2.23			
Physical Activity	0.33	1.75								
mLPP*BF%						0.24	1.45	0.06	2.11	0.16
Model 6			0.27	3.25	0.04			0.27	2.37	0.80
mLPP	0.19	1.09				0.18	0.97			
HOMA-IR	0.24	1.38				0.22	1.23			
Sex	-0.34	-1.95				-	-			
						0.34	1.93			
mLPP*HOMA-IR						0.05	0.26	0.00	0.07	0.80
Model 7			0.33	4.33	0.01			0.46***	5.29***	0.003

<i>ILPP</i>	-0.16	-1.00				-	-			
						0.16	1.05			
<i>BF%</i>	0.39	2.34				0.39	2.51			
						-	-			
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	-0.33	-1.92				0.36	2.27			
<i>ILPP*BF%</i>						0.35	2.40	0.13	5.77	0.02
Model 8			0.24	2.78	0.06			0.26	2.21	0.10
<i>ILPP</i>	-0.05	-0.32				-	-			
						0.15	0.86			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.26	1.53				0.18	1.00			
<i>Sex</i>	-0.38	-2.18								
						-	-			
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>						0.39	2.11			
<i>ILPP*HOMA-IR</i>						0.19	1.13	0.04	1.27	0.27

Table displays the results of each step of the hierarchical moderated regression analyses, which tested whether EPN or LPP voltage amplitudes and BF% or HOMA-IR moderated the mean valence ratings after viewing Negatively-valenced versus Positively-valenced pictures. BF% = body fat percentage; eLPP = early latency late positive potential; EPN = early posterior negativity; HOMA-IR = homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance; ILPP = late latency late positive potential; mLPP = middle latency late positive potential. ** and *** = $p \leq 0.0063$ and ≤ 0.005 , respectively. β shows standardized regression coefficients. Only statistically significant covariates ($p \leq 0.10$) were included in each model.

Table 10. Hierarchical moderated regression results for Negative vs. Positive reaction times.

Variables	Step 1					Step 2				
	β	t	R^2	F	p	β	t	ΔR^2	ΔF	p
Model 1			0.36	3.52	0.02			0.29	2.50	0.07
<i>EPN</i>	-0.48	-2.82				-0.35	-2.05			
<i>BF%</i>	0.13	0.77				0.02	0.14			
<i>Age</i>	0.33	2.04				0.36	2.06			
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	0.36	1.98								
<i>EPN*BF%</i>						-0.16	-0.94	0.03	0.89	0.36
Model 2			0.41	4.30	0.01			0.41	3.36	0.02
<i>EPN</i>	-0.44	-2.64				-0.45	-2.63			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.27	1.62				0.27	1.56			
<i>Age</i>	0.29	1.84				0.31	1.86			
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	0.39	2.28				0.37	2.06			
<i>EPN*HOMA-IR</i>						-0.07	-0.41	0.00	0.17	0.68
Model 3			0.18	1.94	0.15			0.20	1.52	0.23
<i>eLPP</i>	-0.25	-1.31				-0.23	-1.18			
<i>BF%</i>	0.11	0.59				0.13	0.67			
<i>Age</i>	0.35	1.97				0.33	1.75			
<i>eLPP*BF%</i>						0.12	0.62	0.01	0.38	0.54

Model 4			0.27	3.24	0.04			0.22	2.49	0.08
<i>eLPP</i>	-0.31	-1.78				-0.25	-1.32			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.34	1.89				0.33	1.63			
<i>Age</i>	0.29	1.71								
<i>eLPP*HOMA-IR</i>						0.20	1.05	0.03	1.10	0.30
Model 5			0.14	1.37	0.27			0.14	0.99	0.43
<i>mLPP</i>	-0.09	-0.48				-0.09	-0.48			
<i>BF%</i>	0.05	0.28				0.05	0.26			
<i>Age</i>	0.35	1.89				0.35	1.81			
<i>mLPP*BF%</i>						0.01	0.07	0.00	0.01	0.94
Model 6			0.12	1.78	0.19			0.19	2.03	0.14
<i>mLPP</i>	-0.14	-0.78				-0.21	-1.12			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.34	1.83				0.26	1.41			
<i>mLPP*HOMA-IR</i>						0.29	1.53	0.07	2.35	0.14
Model 7			0.19	2.00	0.14			0.20	1.53	0.22
<i>ILPP</i>	-0.25	-1.37				-0.24	-1.30			
<i>BF%</i>	0.03	0.19				0.04	0.21			
<i>Age</i>	0.41	2.25				0.39	2.02			
<i>ILPP*BF%</i>						0.10	0.52	0.01	0.27	0.61
Model 8			0.23	2.63	0.07			0.24	2.00	0.13
<i>ILPP</i>	-0.23	-1.29				-0.23	-1.27			
<i>HOMA-IR</i>	0.22	1.25				0.23	1.25			
<i>Age</i>	0.36	1.99				0.35	1.85			
<i>ILPP*HOMA-IR</i>						0.10	0.58	0.01	0.33	0.57

Table displays the results of each step of the hierarchical moderated regression analyses, which tested whether EPN or LPP voltage amplitudes and BF% or HOMA-IR moderated the mean reaction times after viewing Negatively-valenced versus positive-valenced pictures. BF% = body fat percentage; eLPP = early latency late positive potential; EPN = early posterior negativity; HOMA-IR = homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance; ILPP = late latency late positive potential; mLPP = middle latency late positive potential. β shows standardized regression coefficients. Only statistically significant covariates ($p \leq 0.10$) were included in each model.

4. Discussion

Evidence to support whether obesity is associated with deficits in emotional processing in young adults has been inconsistent in the prevailing literature. Furthermore, whether IR is linked to affective processing impairments in otherwise healthy young adults remains unexplored to date. Furthermore, neuroelectrophysiological investigations of whether adiposity and IR modify the correlation between electrocortical activity and affective processing in young adults is lacking. Therefore, EEG was utilized to investigate whether obesity and/or IR moderated brain potentials and associated affective processing outcomes in young adults.

In the Negative–Neutral trials, young adults without obesity or IR displayed significantly greater LPP amplitudes during the late latency window, in contrast with what was expected. However, among these participants, larger LPP responses were linked to less negative ratings of unpleasant images, suggesting that stronger neural engagement was associated with a dampening of negative emotional experience. By contrast, this relationship was absent in young adults with obesity and/or IR, indicating a disruption in the typical coupling between neural activity and emotional

evaluation. Ordinarily, increased activity in the dlPFC in response to unpleasant stimuli reflects more top-down control to suppress affective responses [21], with successful down-regulation of Negatively-valenced stimuli generally being subsequently manifested as reduced LPP amplitudes [86]. Hence, an inverse relationship between late-window LPP amplitudes and valence ratings (where lower numerical values indicated less negative valence ratings) to unpleasant stimuli in lean, insulin-sensitive young adults was unexpected. Despite this, an inverse LPP amplitudes–valence ratings correlation is in congruence with findings from several studies (e.g., [87–90]). Rather than indicating an unsuccessful dampening of Negatively-valenced stimuli and a concomitant enhancement of negative affective processing, higher LPP amplitudes in the late latency window may instead reflect more effortful spontaneous emotion regulation, as previously suggested [87,90]. Taken together, these findings suggest that lean, insulin-sensitive individuals may attenuate negative affective processing of unpleasant stimuli through greater cognitive effort to automatically regulate these Negatively-valenced stimuli spontaneously.

While these results show that both BF% and IR are independent moderators of brain potentials and negative affective processing in young adults, prior work has suggested that IR may be one mechanism through which obesity alters the neural basis of negative affective processing rather than acting as isolated moderators. Excess body fat has been identified as an independent inducer of IR [91–93], predominantly via the promoting cell dysfunction and inflammation [94]. Given this, it is unsurprising that obesity and IR are risk factors for many of the same health conditions, including mood disorders [2,3,19,29] and emotional processing modifications [7,9,18]. Although a feasible hypothesis, this study lacked the statistical power to test both moderators simultaneously. Future research should test these associations utilizing a larger sample and longitudinal designs.

In the contrasted Positive–Neutral valence trial, neither obesity nor IR were found to moderate the links between LPP amplitudes across any of the latency windows and affective processing scores, implying that neural responses to pleasant stimuli and associated positive affective processing may be spared from obesity- and/or IR-induced brain structural and functional alterations in young adulthood. These results are in concurrence with some [95,96], but not all [97,98] previous findings. The null results found for positive affective processing parameters in this study may be in part explained by differences in neurocircuitry between negative versus positive affective processing. Specifically, the processing of negative emotions more heavily involves activity from the amygdala, anterior insula, anterior cingulate and visual cortices, dlPFC, and vlPFC [99,100], whereas the processing of positive emotions more substantially relies upon activity in the medial prefrontal and orbitofrontal cortices, ventral striatum, nucleus accumbens, and ventral tegmental area [101,102]. Hence, the brain structures involved in positive affective processing may be less susceptible to obesity- and/or IR-linked structural and functional alterations compared to structures that modulate negative affective processing. Still, future studies will be crucial to improving understanding of whether obesity and IR impact brain potentials and positive affective processing in young adulthood.

Moreover, obesity and IR did not moderate the relationships between brain potentials and underlying affective processing in the contrasted Negative–Positive condition. This suggests that, similarly to the early-window LPP, late-window LPP may also be more strongly driven by arousal than by valence and, thus, may not be valence-biased [44,103,104], although this contrasts some prior study findings (e.g., [57]). Moreover, inconsistencies exist in the body of literature that has compared the LPP responses to unpleasant versus pleasant stimuli, with some studies finding no differences in LPP amplitudes between either emotional condition across a wide range of age groups [46,105] and other studies finding valence-specific differentiation, although these findings appeared to be arousal-dependent [57,104]. Significant methodological, LPP quantification, and sample heterogeneity may partially account for such discordant findings.

Finally, BF% and HOMA-IR did not moderate the links between EPN amplitudes and affective processing parameters across any of the contrasted valence conditions. Hence, this suggests that obesity and IR do not impact visual attention allocation to emotional versus neutral stimuli in young adulthood. As far as the authors are aware, this study is the first to investigate whether obesity and/or

IR moderated the relationship between EPN amplitudes and affective processing. Nonetheless, these results are not surprising when considering that the scalp distribution of the EPN component over the occipitotemporal sites reflects visual cortical activity [106], a largely insulin-independent region [107]. One study demonstrated this by showing that insulin infusion had no effect on subsequent visual evoked potentials [108]. Nevertheless, additional research is needed to clarify whether obesity and/or IR influence EPN amplitudes and underlying visual attention allocation to emotional versus neutral stimuli.

This study was not without limitations. First, the sample size was small, hence limiting the generalizability of this study's findings and barring the simultaneous testing of both moderators in one model due to being underpowered. Second, the utilization of the EEG neuroimaging modality in conjunction with the cross-sectional study design barred any causal implications. Third, neural activity measured during exposure to emotional images in a laboratory setting may not necessarily translate to real-world settings. Fourth, HOMA-IR is an index of short-term IR and may not have accurately captured chronic IR in all subjects.

This study also included several strengths. First, the central research questions were novel. Second, EEG provided an inexpensive, non-invasive neuroimaging approach with superior temporal resolution [109,110] compared to fMRI. Third, body composition was measured directly via DEXA, which provided a significantly more accurate quantification of BF% in comparison to indirect measures (e.g., BMI [111]).

5. Conclusions

Obesity and IR moderate the relationship between brain potentials and negative affective processing, but not positive affective processing, in young adults. Specifically, increased neural responses to unpleasant visual stimuli were associated with attenuated negative affective processing in lean and insulin sensitive young adults, whereas no such correlation was found in young adults with obesity or IR. This finding suggests that higher body fat levels and IR may disrupt the typical coupling between neural activity and emotional evaluation of unpleasant stimuli during young adulthood. These data furthermore support prior findings that obesity and IR are both independent risk factors for deficits in affective processing in young adulthood, which may, in turn, increase the risk for mood disorders in this age group. In addition, the degree of visual attention to emotional stimuli is not moderated by obesity or IR in young adulthood. Additional work is warranted to investigate these interrelationships longitudinally with larger sample sizes of young adults using EEG, particularly for positive affective processing.

Supplementary Materials: The following supporting information can be downloaded at the website of this paper posted on Preprints.org, Figures S1a–f: Non-differenced Negative, Neutral, and Positive EPN and LPP waveforms by body fat percentage; Figures S2a–f: Non-differenced Negative, Neutral, and Positive EPN and LPP waveforms by insulin resistance levels.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.W.; methodology, B.L., B.K., T.W. and K.M.; software, A.W.; validation, B.L. and B.K.; formal analysis, B.L.; investigation, B.K., T.W. and K.M.; resources, A.W.; data curation, B.L.; writing—original draft preparation, B.L.; writing—review and editing, B.L., B.K., T.W., K.M., Q.W., P.M., M.F., A.S. and A.W.; visualization, B.L. and B.K.; supervision, B.K., T.W., K.M., Q.W. and A.W.; project administration, A.W.; funding acquisition, A.W. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the National Institute on Aging, grant number R00-AG047282, and by the Alzheimer's Association Research Grant to Promote Diversity, grant number AARGD-17-529552.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Institutional Review Board of Iowa State University (protocol code: 15-101 and date of approval: 26 June 2015).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study. Written informed consent has been obtained from the participant(s) to publish this paper.

Data Availability Statement: Dataset available on request from the authors.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Amy Pollpeter and Tianqi Li for their contributions to the development of this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

BF%	Body fat percentage
BMI	Body mass index
BP	Blood pressure
DEXA/DXA	Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry scan
dIPFC	Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex
EEG	Electroencephalography
eLPP	Late positive potential in the early latency window
EPN	Early posterior negativity
ERP	Event-related potential
fMRI	Functional magnetic resonance imaging
Hemoglobin A1c	Glycated hemoglobin
HOMA-IR	Homeostatic model assessment for insulin resistance
IR	Insulin resistance/resistant
IS	Insulin sensitivity/sensitive
ILPP	Late positive potential in the late latency window
LPP	Late positive potential
mLPP	Late positive potential in the middle latency window
ms	Milliseconds
RT	Reaction time
vIPFC	Ventrolateral prefrontal cortex

Appendix A

Table A1. International Affective Picture System task photo identification numbers by valence condition.

Negative	Neutral	Positive
3030, 3060, 3071, 3100, 3102, 3130, 3150, 3170, 6020, 6230, 6313, 6570, 9040, 9140, 9181, 9253, 9265, 9320, 9420, 9433, 9570, 9571	2372, 2383, 2514, 2840, 5410, 6150, 6900, 7000, 7002, 7006, 7009, 7010, 7035, 7080, 7130, 7170, 7175, 7233, 7491, 7550, 7705	1340, 1463, 2165, 2306, 2374, 4603, 4611, 4652, 4656, 4810, 5202, 5611, 5764, 6250, 7200, 7250, 7508, 8118, 8251, 8500, 9400

Table displays the photo identification number for each photo used in the Negatively-, Neutrally-, and Positively-valenced picture conditions during the International Affective Picture System task.

References

1. Brauer, M.; Roth, G.A.; Aravkin, A.Y.; Zheng, P.; Abate, K.H.; Abate, Y.H.; Abbafati, C.; Abbasgholizadeh, R.; Abbasi, M.A.; Abbasian, M., et al. Global burden and strength of evidence for 88 risk factors in 204 countries and 811 subnational locations, 1990–2021: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *The Lancet* **2024**, *403*, 2162–2203, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00933-4.
2. Panda, S.S.; Nayak, A.; Shah, S.; Aich, P. A systematic review on the association between obesity and mood disorders and the role of gut microbiota. *Metabolites* **2023**, *13*, doi:10.3390/metabo13040488.
3. McElroy, S.L.; Kotwal, R.; Malhotra, S.; Nelson, E.B.; Keck, P.E.; Nemeroff, C.B. Are mood disorders and obesity related? A review for the mental health professional. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* **2004**, *65*, 634–651, quiz 730, doi:10.4088/jcp.v65n0507.
4. Gray, V.; Moot, W.; Frampton, C.M.A.; Douglas, K.M.; Gallagher, P.; Jordan, J.; Carter, J.D.; Inder, M.; Crowe, M.; McIntosh, V.V.W., et al. The effect of age on emotion processing in individuals with mood disorders and in healthy individuals. *Front. Psychol.* **2024**, *15*, 1204204, doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1204204.
5. Panchal, P.; Kaltenboeck, A.; Harmer, C.J. Cognitive emotional processing across mood disorders. *CNS Spectr* **2019**, *24*, 54–63, doi:10.1017/s109285291800130x.
6. Hanson, J.A.; Wagner, G.; Dretsch, M. Cognitive disinhibition and infrequent moderate-to-intense physical activity linked with obesity in U.S. soldiers. *Eating and Weight Disorders - Studies on Anorexia, Bulimia and Obesity* **2021**, *26*, 973–981, doi:10.1007/s40519-020-00932-5.
7. Romero-Rebollar, C.; García-Gómez, L.; Báez-Yáñez, M.G.; Gutiérrez-Aguilar, R.; Pacheco-López, G. Adiposity affects emotional information processing. *Front. Psychol.* **2022**, Volume 13 - 2022, doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.879065.
8. Scarpina, F.; Varallo, G.; Castelnovo, G.; Capodaglio, P.; Molinari, E.; Mauro, A. Correction to: Implicit facial emotion recognition of fear and anger in obesity. *Eating and Weight Disorders - Studies on Anorexia, Bulimia and Obesity* **2021**, *26*, 1281–1281, doi:10.1007/s40519-020-01042-y.
9. Wegener, I.; Wawrzyniak, A.; Imbierowicz, K.; Conrad, R.; Musch, J.; Geiser, F.; Wermter, F.; Liedtke, R. Evidence for attenuated affective processing in obesity. *Psychol Rep* **2008**, *103*, 35–47, doi:10.2466/pr0.103.1.35-47.
10. Fernandes, J.; Ferreira-Santos, F.; Miller, K.; Torres, S. Emotional processing in obesity: a systematic review and exploratory meta-analysis. *Obes. Rev.* **2018**, *19*, 111–120, doi:10.1111/obr.12607.
11. Surcinelli, P.; Baldaro, B.; Balsamo, A.; Bolzani, R.; Gennari, M.; Rossi, N.C. Emotion recognition and expression in young obese participants: Preliminary study. *Percept. Mot. Skills* **2007**, *105*, 477–482, doi:10.2466/pms.105.2.477-482.
12. Fan, Y.; Fan, A.; Yang, Z.; Fan, D. Global burden of mental disorders in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2021: Results from the global burden of disease study 2021. *BMC Psychiatry* **2025**, *25*, 486, doi:10.1186/s12888-025-06932-y.
13. Fernandes, B.S.; Salagre, E.; Enduru, N.; Grande, I.; Vieta, E.; Zhao, Z. Insulin resistance in depression: A large meta-analysis of metabolic parameters and variation. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* **2022**, *139*, 104758, doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104758.
14. Hajek, T.; McIntyre, R.; Alda, M. Bipolar disorders, type 2 diabetes mellitus, and the brain. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* **2016**, *29*, 1–6, doi:10.1097/ycp.0000000000000215.
15. Woods, S.C.; Seeley, R.J.; Baskin, D.G.; Schwartz, M.W. Insulin and the blood-brain barrier. *Curr. Pharm. Des.* **2003**, *9*, 795–800, doi:10.2174/1381612033455323.
16. Freeman, A.; Pennings, N. *Insulin resistance*; StatPearls Publishing Inc.: Treasure Island, FL, 2019.
17. Singh, M.K.; Leslie, S.M.; Packer, M.M.; Zaiko, Y.V.; Phillips, O.R.; Weisman, E.F.; Wall, D.M.; Jo, B.; Rasgon, N. Brain and behavioral correlates of insulin resistance in youth with depression and obesity. *Horm Behav* **2019**, *108*, 73–83, doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2018.03.009.
18. Marsh, C.A.; Berent-Spillon, A.; Love, T.; Persad, C.C.; Pop-Busui, R.; Zubieta, J.K.; Smith, Y.R. Functional neuroimaging of emotional processing in women with polycystic ovary syndrome: A case-control pilot study. *Fertil Steril* **2013**, *100*, 200–207.e201, doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2013.02.054.
19. Martin, H.; Bullich, S.; Martinat, M.; Chataigner, M.; Di Miceli, M.; Simon, V.; Clark, S.; Butler, J.; Schell, M.; Chopra, S., et al. Insulin modulates emotional behavior through a serotonin-dependent mechanism. *Mol. Psychiatry* **2024**, *29*, 1610–1619, doi:10.1038/s41380-022-01812-3.

20. Breiter, H.C.; Etcoff, N.L.; Whalen, P.J.; Kennedy, W.A.; Rauch, S.L.; Buckner, R.L.; Strauss, M.M.; Hyman, S.E.; Rosen, B.R. Response and habituation of the human amygdala during visual processing of facial expression. *Neuron* **1996**, *17*, 875-887, doi:10.1016/S0896-6273(00)80219-6.
21. Kohn, N.; Eickhoff, S.B.; Scheller, M.; Laird, A.R.; Fox, P.T.; Habel, U. Neural network of cognitive emotion regulation--An ALE meta-analysis and MACM analysis. *NeuroImage* **2014**, *87*, 345-355, doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.11.001.
22. de Weijer, B.A.; van de Giessen, E.; van Amelsvoort, T.A.; Boot, E.; Braak, B.; Janssen, I.M.; van de Laar, A.; Fliers, E.; Serlie, M.J.; Booij, J. Lower striatal dopamine D2/3 receptor availability in obese compared with non-obese subjects. *European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging Research* **2011**, *1*, 37, doi:10.1186/2191-219x-1-37.
23. Volkow, N.D.; Wang, G.J.; Telang, F.; Fowler, J.S.; Thanos, P.K.; Logan, J.; Alexoff, D.; Ding, Y.S.; Wong, C.; Ma, Y., et al. Low dopamine striatal D2 receptors are associated with prefrontal metabolism in obese subjects: Possible contributing factors. *NeuroImage* **2008**, *42*, 1537-1543, doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.06.002.
24. Osugo, M.; Wall, M.B.; Selvaggi, P.; Zahid, U.; Finelli, V.; Chapman, G.E.; Whitehurst, T.; Onwordi, E.C.; Statton, B.; McCutcheon, R.A., et al. Striatal dopamine D2/D3 receptor regulation of human reward processing and behaviour. *Nat. Commun.* **2025**, *16*, 1852, doi:10.1038/s41467-025-56663-7.
25. Park, B.-y.; Hong, J.; Park, H. Neuroimaging biomarkers to associate obesity and negative emotions. *Sci. Rep.* **2017**, *7*, 7664, doi:10.1038/s41598-017-08272-8.
26. Sripecthwandee, J.; Chattipakorn, N.; Chattipakorn, S.C. Links between obesity-induced brain insulin resistance, brain mitochondrial dysfunction, and dementia. *Front. Endocrinol. (Lausanne)* **2018**, *9*, 496, doi:10.3389/fendo.2018.00496.
27. Bingham, E.M.; Hopkins, D.; Smith, D.; Pernet, A.; Hallett, W.; Reed, L.; Marsden, P.K.; Amiel, S.A. The role of insulin in human brain glucose metabolism: An 18fluoro-deoxyglucose positron emission tomography study. *Diabetes* **2002**, *51*, 3384-3390, doi:10.2337/diabetes.51.12.3384.
28. Willette, A.A.; Xu, G.; Johnson, S.C.; Birdsill, A.C.; Jonaitis, E.M.; Sager, M.A.; Hermann, B.P.; La Rue, A.; Asthana, S.; Bendlin, B.B. Insulin resistance, brain atrophy, and cognitive performance in late middle-aged adults. *Diabetes Care* **2013**, *36*, 443-449, doi:10.2337/dc12-0922.
29. Kleinridders, A.; Cai, W.; Cappellucci, L.; Ghazarian, A.; Collins, W.R.; Vienberg, S.G.; Pothos, E.N.; Kahn, C.R. Insulin resistance in brain alters dopamine turnover and causes behavioral disorders. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **2015**, *112*, 3463-3468, doi:10.1073/pnas.1500877112.
30. Steward, T.; Píco-Pérez, M.; Mata, F.; Martínez-Zalacaín, I.; Cano, M.; Contreras-Rodríguez, O.; Fernández-Aranda, F.; Yucel, M.; Soriano-Mas, C.; Verdejo-García, A. Emotion regulation and excess weight: Impaired affective processing characterized by dysfunctional insula activation and connectivity. *PLoS One* **2016**, *11*, e0152150, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0152150.
31. Chen, Y.-H.; Chen, C.; Jian, H.-Y.; Chen, Y.-C.; Fan, Y.-T.; Yang, C.-Y.; Cheng, Y. The neural correlates of emotional conflict monitoring as an early manifestation of affective and cognitive declines in persons with Type 2 diabetes. *Brain Communications* **2023**, *5*, doi:10.1093/braincomms/fcad022.
32. Peng, F.; Lambert, K.J.M.; Bakhtiari, R.; Singhal, A. Handedness modulates emotion cognition interactions as revealed by ERPs and alpha oscillations. *Sci. Rep.* **2025**, *15*, 25908, doi:10.1038/s41598-025-08600-3.
33. Mora-Quiroga, J.; Abril-Ronderos, J.P.; Lamprea, M.R. Reciprocal competition between cognitive tasks and emotional processing revealed by EEG and eye tracking. *Int. J. Psychophysiol.* **2025**, *214*, 113221, doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2025.113221.
34. Houck, A.P.; Richards, J.K.; Day, T.C.; Goodwill, J.J.; Hauschild, K.M.; Malik, I.; Lerner, M.D. Automatic and affective processing of faces as mechanisms of passing as non-autistic in adolescence. *Sci. Rep.* **2025**, *15*, 22850, doi:10.1038/s41598-025-04801-y.
35. Zhang, H.; Fu, Z.; Cao, C.; Wang, S.; Li, H.; Xie, H.; Zhou, Y.; Li, X.; Song, J. Impairment of emotional processing from cumulative repetitive subconcussion: Evidence from event-related potentials and sLORETA in parachuters. *Neuroscience* **2025**, *579*, 1-9, doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2025.05.033.

36. Wolf, T.; Tsenkova, V.; Ryff, C.D.; Davidson, R.J.; Willette, A.A. Neural, hormonal, and cognitive correlates of metabolic dysfunction and emotional reactivity. *Psychosom. Med.* **2018**, *80*, 452-459, doi:10.1097/psy.0000000000000582.
37. Solmi, M.; Radua, J.; Olivola, M.; Croce, E.; Soardo, L.; Salazar de Pablo, G.; Il Shin, J.; Kirkbride, J.B.; Jones, P.; Kim, J.H., et al. Age at onset of mental disorders worldwide: Large-scale meta-analysis of 192 epidemiological studies. *Mol. Psychiatry* **2022**, *27*, 281-295, doi:10.1038/s41380-021-01161-7.
38. McWeeny, S.; Norton, E.S. Understanding event-related potentials (ERPs) in clinical and basic language and communication disorders research: A tutorial. *Int. J. Lang. Commun. Disord.* **2020**, *55*, 445-457, doi:10.1111/1460-6984.12535.
39. Woodman, G.F. A brief introduction to the use of event-related potentials in studies of perception and attention. *Atten Percept Psychophys* **2010**, *72*, 2031-2046, doi:10.3758/APP.72.8.2031.
40. Brown, S.B.; van Steenbergen, H.; Band, G.P.; de Rover, M.; Nieuwenhuis, S. Functional significance of the emotion-related late positive potential. *Front Hum Neurosci* **2012**, *6*, 33, doi:10.3389/fnhum.2012.00033.
41. Luck, S.J. Event-related potentials. **2012**.
42. Schupp, H.T.; Junghöfer, M.; Weike, A.I.; Hamm, A.O. The selective processing of briefly presented affective pictures: An ERP analysis. *Psychophysiology* **2004**, *41*, 441-449, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8986.2004.00174.x.
43. Frank, D.W.; Sabatinelli, D. Hemodynamic and electrocortical reactivity to specific scene contents in emotional perception. *Psychophysiology* **2019**, *56*, e13340, doi:10.1111/psyp.13340.
44. Cuthbert, B.N.; Schupp, H.T.; Bradley, M.M.; Birbaumer, N.; Lang, P.J. Brain potentials in affective picture processing: Covariation with autonomic arousal and affective report. *Biol. Psychol.* **2000**, *52*, 95-111, doi:10.1016/s0301-0511(99)00044-7.
45. Moran, T.P.; Jendrusina, A.A.; Moser, J.S. The psychometric properties of the late positive potential during emotion processing and regulation. *Brain Res* **2013**, *1516*, 66-75, doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2013.04.018.
46. Liu, Y.; Huang, H.; McGinnis-Deweese, M.; Keil, A.; Ding, M. Neural substrate of the late positive potential in emotional processing. *J Neurosci* **2012**, *32*, 14563-14572, doi:10.1523/jneurosci.3109-12.2012.
47. Keil, A.; Bradley, M.M.; Hauk, O.; Rockstroh, B.; Elbert, T.; Lang, P.J. Large-scale neural correlates of affective picture processing. *Psychophysiology* **2002**, *39*, 641-649.
48. Schupp, H.T.; Cuthbert, B.N.; Bradley, M.M.; Cacioppo, J.T.; Ito, T.; Lang, P.J. Affective picture processing: The late positive potential is modulated by motivational relevance. *Psychophysiology* **2000**, *37*, 257-261, doi:10.1111/1469-8986.3720257.
49. Hajcak, G.; Dunning, J.P.; Foti, D. Motivated and controlled attention to emotion: Time-course of the late positive potential. *Clin. Neurophysiol.* **2009**, *120*, 505-510, doi:10.1016/j.clinph.2008.11.028.
50. Hajcak, G.; MacNamara, A.; Olvet, D.M. Event-related potentials, emotion, and emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Dev. Neuropsychol.* **2010**, *35*, 129-155, doi:10.1080/87565640903526504.
51. Schupp, H.T.; Flaisch, T.; Stockburger, J.; Junghöfer, M. Emotion and attention: Event-related brain potential studies. In *Progress in Brain Research*, Anders, S., Ende, G., Junghofer, M., Kissler, J., Wildgruber, D., Eds. Elsevier: 2006; Vol. 156, pp. 31-51.
52. Fields, E.C. The P300, the LPP, context updating, and memory: What is the functional significance of the emotion-related late positive potential? *Int. J. Psychophysiol.* **2023**, *192*, 43-52, doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2023.08.005.
53. Dolcos, F.; Cabeza, R. Event-related potentials of emotional memory: Encoding pleasant, unpleasant, and neutral pictures. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience* **2002**, *2*, 252-263, doi:10.3758/CABN.2.3.252.
54. Macnamara, A.; Foti, D.; Hajcak, G. Tell me about it: Neural activity elicited by emotional pictures and preceding descriptions. *Emotion* **2009**, *9*, 531-543, doi:10.1037/a0016251.
55. Foti, D.; Hajcak, G.; Dien, J. Differentiating neural responses to emotional pictures: Evidence from temporal-spatial PCA. *Psychophysiology* **2009**, *46*, 521-530, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8986.2009.00796.x.
56. Hajcak, G.; Weinberg, A.; MacNamara, A.; Foti, D. ERPs and the Study of Emotion. In *The Oxford Handbook of Event-Related Potential Components*, Kappenman, E.S., Luck, S.J., Eds. Oxford University Press: 2011; 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195374148.013.0222p. 0.

57. O'Hare, A.J.; Atchley, R.A.; Young, K.M. Valence and arousal influence the late positive potential during central and lateralized presentation of images. *Laterality* **2017**, *22*, 541-559, doi:10.1080/1357650x.2016.1241257.
58. Matthews, D.R.; Hosker, J.P.; Rudenski, A.S.; Naylor, B.A.; Treacher, D.F.; Turner, R.C. Homeostasis model assessment: Insulin resistance and beta-cell function from fasting plasma glucose and insulin concentrations in man. *Diabetologia* **1985**, *28*, 412-419, doi:10.1007/bf00280883.
59. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans*; U.S. Dept of Health and Human Services: Washinton, D.C., 2018.
60. Larsen, B.A.; Klindinst, B.S.; Wolf, T.; McLimans, K.E.; Wang, Q.; Pollpeter, A.; Li, T.; Mohammadiarveje, P.; Fili, M.; Grundy, J.G., et al. Adiposity and insulin resistance moderate the links between neuroelectrophysiology and working and episodic memory functions in young adult males but not females. *Physiol Behav* **2023**, *271*, 114321, doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2023.114321.
61. Lang, P.J.; Bradley, M.M.; Cuthbert, B.N. *International affective picture system (IAPS): Affective ratings of pictures and instruction manual, Technical Report A-8*; University of Florida: Gainesville, FL, 2008.
62. Psychology Software Tools. E-Prime. Available online: <https://pstnet.com/products/e-prime/> (accessed on 3 August 2024).
63. Shaygan, M.; Böger, A.; Kröner-Herwig, B. Valence and arousal value of visual stimuli and their role in the mitigation of chronic pain: What is the power of pictures? *The Journal of Pain* **2017**, *18*, 124-131, doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2016.10.007.
64. Calvo, M.G.; Averro, P. Reaction time normative data for the IAPS as a function of display time, gender, and picture content. *Behav. Res. Methods* **2009**, *41*, 184-191, doi:10.3758/brm.41.1.184.
65. Baumeister, R.F.; Bratslavsky, E.; Finkenauer, C.; Vohs, K.D. Bad is stronger than good. *Rev. Gen. Psychol.* **2001**, *5*, 323-370, doi:10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.323.
66. Striepen, N.; Scheele, D.; Kendrick, K.M.; Becker, B.; Schäfer, L.; Schwalba, K.; Reul, J.; Maier, W.; Hurlmann, R. Oxytocin facilitates protective responses to aversive social stimuli in males. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **2012**, *109*, 18144-18149, doi:10.1073/pnas.1208852109.
67. Yuan, J.; Chen, J.; Yang, J.; Ju, E.; Norman, G.J.; Ding, N. Negative mood state enhances the susceptibility to unpleasant events: Neural correlates from a music-primed emotion classification task. *PLoS One* **2014**, *9*, e89844, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0089844.
68. Botelho, C.; Pasion, R.; Prata, C.; Barbosa, F. Neuronal underpinnings of the attentional bias toward threat in the anxiety spectrum: Meta-analytical data on P3 and LPP event-related potentials. *Biol. Psychol.* **2023**, *176*, 108475, doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2022.108475.
69. Duan, H.; Yao, Z.; Zhang, L.; Kohn, N.; Wu, J. The late positive potentials evoked by negative emotional pictures predict autonomic responses to an acute psychosocial stressor in healthy adults. *medRxiv* **2021**, 10.1101/2021.05.18.21257390, 2021.2005.2018.21257390, doi:10.1101/2021.05.18.21257390.
70. Delorme, A.; Makeig, S. EEGLAB: An open source toolbox for analysis of single-trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *J Neurosci Methods* **2004**, *134*, 9-21, doi:10.1016/j.jneumeth.2003.10.009.
71. Winkler, I.; Haufe, S.; Tangermann, M. Automatic classification of artifactual ICA-components for artifact removal in EEG signals. *Behav. Brain Funct.* **2011**, *7*, 30, doi:10.1186/1744-9081-7-30.
72. Winkler, I.; Brandl, S.; Horn, F.; Waldburger, E.; Allefeld, C.; Tangermann, M. Robust artifactual independent component classification for BCI practitioners. *J. Neural Eng.* **2014**, *11*.
73. Mognon, A.; Jovicich, J.; Bruzzone, L.; Buiatti, M. ADJUST: An automatic EEG artifact detector based on the joint use of spatial and temporal features. *Psychophysiology* **2011**, *48*, 229-240, doi:10.1111/j.1469-8986.2010.01061.x.
74. Farkas, A.H.; Sabatinelli, D. Emotional perception: Divergence of early and late event-related potential modulation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* **2023**, *35*, 941-956, doi:10.1162/jocn_a_01984.
75. Zhang, W.; Jończyk, R.; Wu, Y.J.; Lan, Y.; Gao, Z.; Hu, J.; Thierry, G.; Gao, S. Brain potentials reveal how emotion filters native language access when bilinguals read words in their second language. *Cerebral Cortex* **2023**, *33*, 8783-8791, doi:10.1093/cercor/bhad161.

76. Moretta, T.; Buodo, G. Motivated attention to stimuli related to social networking sites: A cue-reactivity study. *J Behav Addict* **2021**, *10*, 314-326, doi:10.1556/2006.2021.00040.
77. Nordström, H.; Wiens, S. Emotional event-related potentials are larger to figures than scenes but are similarly reduced by inattention. *BMC Neurosci.* **2012**, *13*, 49, doi:10.1186/1471-2202-13-49.
78. Kim, B.M.; Lee, J.; Choi, A.R.; Chung, S.J.; Park, M.; Koo, J.W.; Kang, U.G.; Choi, J.S. Event-related brain response to visual cues in individuals with internet gaming disorder: Relevance to attentional bias and decision-making. *Transl Psychiatry* **2021**, *11*, 258, doi:10.1038/s41398-021-01375-x.
79. Willroth, E.C.; Koban, L.; Hilimire, M.R. Social information influences emotional experience and late positive potential response to affective pictures. *Emotion* **2017**, *17*, 572-576, doi:10.1037/emo0000289.
80. Goto, N.; Mushtaq, F.; Shee, D.; Lim, X.L.; Mortazavi, M.; Watabe, M.; Schaefer, A. Neural signals of selective attention are modulated by subjective preferences and buying decisions in a virtual shopping task. *Biol. Psychol.* **2017**, *128*, 11-20, doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2017.06.004.
81. Kessel, E.M.; Huselid, R.F.; Decicco, J.M.; Dennis, T.A. Neurophysiological processing of emotion and parenting interact to predict inhibited behavior: An affective-motivational framework. *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* **2013**, *7*, 326, doi:10.3389/fnhum.2013.00326.
82. World Health Organization. Physical status: The use and interpretation of anthropometry. Report of a WHO Expert Committee. *World Health Organ. Tech. Rep. Ser.* **1995**, *854*, 1-452.
83. Lee, C.H.; Shih, A.Z.; Woo, Y.C.; Fong, C.H.; Leung, O.Y.; Janus, E.; Cheung, B.M.; Lam, K.S. Optimal cut-offs of Homeostasis Model Assessment of Insulin Resistance (HOMA-IR) to identify dysglycemia and type 2 diabetes mellitus: A 15-year prospective study in Chinese. *PLoS One* **2016**, *11*, e0163424, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0163424.
84. Balkau, B.; Charles, M.A. Comment on the provisional report from the WHO consultation. European Group for the Study of Insulin Resistance (EGIR). *Diabet. Med.* **1999**, *16*, 442-443, doi:10.1046/j.1464-5491.1999.00059.x.
85. Hayes, A.F. *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis, Third Edition: A Regression-Based Approach*, 3rd ed.; Guilford publications: New York, NY, 2022.
86. Hajcak, G.; Anderson, B.S.; Arana, A.; Borckardt, J.; Takacs, I.; George, M.S.; Nahas, Z. Dorsolateral prefrontal cortex stimulation modulates electrocortical measures of visual attention: Evidence from direct bilateral epidural cortical stimulation in treatment-resistant mood disorder. *Neuroscience* **2010**, *170*, 281-288, doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2010.04.069.
87. Langeslag, S.J.E.; Surti, K. The effect of arousal on regulation of negative emotions using cognitive reappraisal: An ERP study. *Int. J. Psychophysiol.* **2017**, *118*, 18-26, doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2017.05.012.
88. Wu, H.; Tang, P.; Huang, X.; Hu, X.; Luo, Y. Differentiating electrophysiological response to decrease and increase negative emotion regulation. *Chinese Science Bulletin* **2013**, *58*, 1543-1550, doi:10.1007/s11434-013-5746-x.
89. Bamford, S.; Broyd, S.J.; Benikos, N.; Ward, R.; Wiersma, J.R.; Sonuga-Barke, E. The late positive potential: A neural marker of the regulation of emotion-based approach-avoidance actions? *Biol. Psychol.* **2015**, *105*, 115-123, doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2015.01.009.
90. Baur, R.; Conzelmann, A.; Wieser, M.J.; Pauli, P. Spontaneous emotion regulation: Differential effects on evoked brain potentials and facial muscle activity. *Int. J. Psychophysiol.* **2015**, *96*, 38-48, doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2015.02.022.
91. Hardy, O.T.; Czech, M.P.; Corvera, S. What causes the insulin resistance underlying obesity? *Curr. Opin. Endocrinol. Diabetes Obes.* **2012**, *19*, 81-87, doi:10.1097/MED.0b013e3283514e13.
92. Dhokte, S.; Czaja, K. Visceral adipose tissue: The hidden culprit for type 2 diabetes. *Nutrients* **2024**, *16*, doi:10.3390/nu16071015.
93. Ahmed, B.; Sultana, R.; Greene, M.W. Adipose tissue and insulin resistance in obese. *Biomed. Pharmacother.* **2021**, *137*, 111315, doi:10.1016/j.biopha.2021.111315.
94. Stenkula, K.G.; Erlanson-Albertsson, C. Adipose cell size: Importance in health and disease. *American Journal of Physiology-Regulatory, Integrative and Comparative Physiology* **2018**, *315*, R284-R295, doi:10.1152/ajpregu.00257.2017.

95. Vallet, W.; Hone-Blanchet, A.; Brunelin, J. Abnormalities of the late positive potential during emotional processing in individuals with psychopathic traits: A meta-analysis. *Psychol. Med.* **2020**, *50*, 2085-2095, doi:10.1017/s0033291719002216.
96. Bylsma, L.M.; Tan, P.Z.; Silk, J.S.; Forbes, E.E.; McMakin, D.L.; Dahl, R.E.; Ryan, N.D.; Ladouceur, C.D. The late positive potential during affective picture processing: Associations with daily life emotional functioning among adolescents with anxiety disorders. *Int. J. Psychophysiol.* **2022**, *182*, 70-80, doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2022.09.009.
97. Hajcak, G.; Moser, J.S.; Simons, R.F. Attending to affect: Appraisal strategies modulate the electrocortical response to arousing pictures. *Emotion* **2006**, *6*, 517-522, doi:10.1037/1528-3542.6.3.517.
98. Krompinger, J.W.; Moser, J.S.; Simons, R.F. Modulations of the electrophysiological response to pleasant stimuli by cognitive reappraisal. *Emotion* **2008**, *8*, 132-137, doi:10.1037/1528-3542.8.1.132.
99. Tolomeo, S.; Christmas, D.; Jentzsch, I.; Johnston, B.; Sprengelmeyer, R.; Matthews, K.; Douglas Steele, J. A causal role for the anterior mid-cingulate cortex in negative affect and cognitive control. *Brain* **2016**, *139*, 1844-1854, doi:10.1093/brain/aww069.
100. Cheng, S.; Qiu, X.; Mo, L.; Li, S.; Xu, F.; Zhang, D. Asynchronous involvement of VLPFC and dlPFC during negative emotion processing: An online transcranial magnetic stimulation study. *Neuroscience* **2024**, *551*, 237-245, doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2024.05.041.
101. Machado, L.; Cantilino, A. A systematic review of the neural correlates of positive emotions. *Braz J Psychiatry* **2017**, *39*, 172-179, doi:10.1590/1516-4446-2016-1988.
102. Rolls, E.T. Emotion, motivation, decision-making, the orbitofrontal cortex, anterior cingulate cortex, and the amygdala. *Brain Structure and Function* **2023**, *228*, 1201-1257, doi:10.1007/s00429-023-02644-9.
103. Leite, J.; Carvalho, S.; Galdo-Alvarez, S.; Alves, J.; Sampaio, A.; Gonçalves, O.F. Affective picture modulation: Valence, arousal, attention allocation and motivational significance. *Int. J. Psychophysiol.* **2012**, *83*, 375-381, doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2011.12.005.
104. Feng, C.; Li, W.; Tian, T.; Luo, Y.; Gu, R.; Zhou, C.; Luo, Y.-j. Arousal modulates valence effects on both early and late stages of affective picture processing in a passive viewing task. *Soc. Neurosci.* **2014**, *9*, 364-377, doi:10.1080/17470919.2014.896827.
105. Renfroe, J.B.; Bradley, M.M.; Sege, C.T.; Bowers, D. Emotional modulation of the late positive potential during picture free viewing in older and young adults. *PLoS One* **2016**, *11*, e0162323, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0162323.
106. Schupp, H.T.; Markus, J.; Weike, A.I.; Hamm, A.O. Emotional facilitation of sensory processing in the visual cortex. *Psychol. Sci.* **2003**, *14*, 7-13, doi:10.1111/1467-9280.01411.
107. Milstein, J.L.; Ferris, H.A. The brain as an insulin-sensitive metabolic organ. *Mol Metab* **2021**, *52*, 101234, doi:10.1016/j.molmet.2021.101234.
108. Benedict, L.; Nelson, C.A.; Schunk, E.; Sullwold, K.; Seaquist, E.R. Effect of insulin on the brain activity obtained during visual and memory tasks in healthy human subjects. *Neuroendocrinology* **2006**, *83*, 20-26, doi:10.1159/000093338.
109. Gevins, A.; Smith, M.E.; McEvoy, L.K.; Leong, H.; Le, J. Electroencephalographic imaging of higher brain function. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **1999**, *354*, 1125-1133, doi:10.1098/rstb.1999.0468.
110. Eryilmaz, H.H.; Duru, A.D.; Parlak, B.; Ademoglu, A.; Demiralp, T. Neuroimaging of event related brain potentials (ERP) using fMRI and dipole source reconstruction. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* **2007**, *2007*, 3384-3387, doi:10.1109/iembs.2007.4353057.
111. Laskey, M.A. Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry and body composition. *Nutrition* **1996**, *12*, 45-51, doi:10.1016/0899-9007(95)00017-8.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.