Journal of Advanced Medical and Dental Sciences Research

@Society of Scientific Research and Studies

Journal home page:www.jamdsr.com doi:10.21276/jamdsr Index Copernicus value [ICV] =82.06

(e) ISSN Online: 2321-9599; (p) ISSN Print: 2348-6805

Original Research

Somatic Markers and Behavioural Decision Making: The Role of Body Signals in Cognitive Processes

[1]Venkateswar Pujari, [2]S. Parvathisam

[1]Chief Mentor, Body Brain Behaviour Foundation, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India;
[2]Chief Executive Officer, Q1 Hospital, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT:
The integration of somatic markers, which are bodily signals associated with emotions, with cognitive processes plays a crucial role in decision making. This review paper explores the role of somatic markers in behavioral decision making and their impact on cognitive processes. Five key areas are discussed: (1) Definition and theoretical foundations of somatic markers; (2) Neural mechanisms underlying somatic markers; (3) Influence of somatic markers on decision making; (4) Impact of somatic markers on risk perception and reward processing; and (5) Clinical implications and future directions. Through an extensive literature review, this paper provides insights into the complex interplay between somatic markers and cognitive processes, shedding light on their potential applications in clinical settings and highlighting future research directions. Understanding the role of somatic markers in decision making has important implications for psychiatric disorders and addictive behaviors. Therapeutic interventions targeting somatic markers may help improve decision-making abilities. Future research should focus on unraveling the underlying neural mechanisms of somatic markers and exploring individual differences in somatic marker functioning to identify biomarkers for decision-making abilities and vulnerability to psychiatric disorders.
Keywords: Somatic markers, Behavioral decision making, Cognitive processes, Emotions, Neural mechanisms.

Received: 10 March, 2019 Accepted: 15 April 2019

Corresponding author: Venkateswar Pujari, Chief Mentor, Body Brain Behaviour Foundation, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India

This article may be cited as: Pujari V, Parvathisam S. Somatic Markers and Behavioural Decision Making: The Role of Body Signals in Cognitive Processes. J Adv Med Dent Scie Res 2019;7(5):192-196.

INTRODUCTION

Behavioral decision making is a complex cognitive process that involves evaluating multiple options, weighing potential risks and rewards, and selecting the most appropriate course of action. Traditional decision-making theories have predominantly focused on rational processes based on objective information [1]. However, it has become increasingly evident that emotions and bodily signals, known as somatic markers, play a critical role in guiding decision-making processes.

Somatic markers are physiological changes that occur in response to emotional stimuli and provide a mental representation of the emotional experience [2]. According to Antonio Damasio's Somatic Marker Hypothesis, these bodily signals serve as "markers" that aid in evaluating the potential positive or negative outcomes associated with a particular decision [3]. These markers are acquired through experiences and are linked to emotions and memories, influencing future decision making.

Neuroimaging studies have elucidated the neural mechanisms underlying somatic markers. The ventromedial prefrontal cortex, amygdala, and insula are key brain regions involved in processing somatic markers [4]. These areas interact with other cortical and subcortical regions to integrate emotional signals with cognitive processes, ultimately influencing decision making.

While traditional decision-making theories emphasized the role of rationality, research has demonstrated that emotions and somatic markers significantly impact decision making. Individuals with impaired somatic marker functioning exhibit difficulties in making advantageous decisions [5]. The Iowa Gambling Task, a widely used paradigm, has revealed that participants with intact somatic marker functioning consistently make better decisions [6].

In summary, the integration of somatic markers with cognitive processes plays a crucial role in behavioral decision making. By examining the definition, theoretical foundations, and neural mechanisms of somatic markers, we can gain insights into the complex interplay between emotions, bodily signals, and decision-making processes. Understanding the impact of somatic markers on decision making has important implications for various domains, including psychology, neuroscience, and clinical practice.

DEFINITION AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF SOMATIC MARKERS

Somatic markers refer to physiological changes that occur in response to emotional stimuli and provide a mental representation of the emotional experience. Antonio Damasio's Somatic Marker Hypothesis suggests that these bodily signals serve as "markers" that aid in evaluating the potential positive or negative outcomes associated with a particular decision. These markers are acquired through experiences and are linked to emotions and memories, influencing future decision making.

NEURAL MECHANISMS UNDERLYING SOMATIC MARKERS

Understanding the neural mechanisms underlying somatic markers is crucial for comprehending their role in behavioral decision making. Neuroimaging studies have provided valuable insights into the brain regions involved in processing and integrating emotional signals with cognitive processes.

The ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) is a key region implicated in the generation and integration of somatic markers. Damage to the vmPFC has been shown to impair somatic marker processing and result in deficits in decision making [1,7]. The vmPFC receives inputs from other brain regions involved in emotion and memory, such as the amygdala and insula, and integrates this information to guide decision making [2,8,9].

The amygdala, known for its role in emotional processing, plays a vital role in the generation and storage of emotional memories associated with somatic markers. It facilitates the association between emotionally salient stimuli and the physiological responses that comprise somatic markers [3]. The amygdala's interaction with the vmPFC and other brain regions enables the modulation of decision making based on emotional significance.

The insula, a region involved in interoceptive awareness, also contributes to somatic marker processing. It receives signals from the body and integrates them with emotional states, providing a link between bodily responses and decision making [4,10]. The insula's involvement in somatic marker processing is particularly relevant in situations where bodily sensations play a significant role in guiding decisions, such as risky or ambiguous scenarios.

Other regions, such as the anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), play a role in monitoring and conflict detection during decision making. The ACC detects discrepancies between expected and actual outcomes and guides adjustments in decision strategies [5,11]. It interacts with the vmPFC and other regions involved in somatic marker processing to regulate decision making based on emotional feedback.

In summary, the neural mechanisms underlying somatic markers involve the intricate interplay of multiple brain regions. The vmPFC, amygdala, insula, and ACC are key players in processing and integrating emotional signals with cognitive processes. Further research utilizing advanced neuroimaging techniques and experimental paradigms will provide a more comprehensive understanding of the precise mechanisms through which somatic markers influence decision making.

INFLUENCE OF SOMATIC MARKERS ON DECISION MAKING

Somatic markers, as integrators of emotional signals and bodily responses, significantly influence decision making. Their impact can be observed in various aspects of decision-making processes, including risk perception, reward processing, and the evaluation of options.

One way in which somatic markers influence decision making is through risk perception. Somatic markers provide a bodily representation of emotional experiences associated with potential outcomes, allowing individuals to assess the level of risk associated with different choices [11]. Research has shown that individuals with intact somatic marker functioning exhibit a heightened sensitivity to risky situations, leading to more cautious decision making [12]. In contrast, individuals with impaired somatic marker functioning tend to make riskier choices due to a reduced ability to anticipate negative outcomes [13].

Somatic markers also play a role in reward processing, influencing the evaluation of potential rewards and the motivation to seek them. Positive somatic markers associated with rewarding outcomes bias decision making towards options that are perceived as more beneficial [14]. Conversely, negative somatic markers serve as warnings, guiding individuals away from options associated with potential negative outcomes [15]. The integration of somatic markers with cognitive processes allows for a more comprehensive evaluation of the value and desirability of different choices.

Furthermore, somatic markers contribute to the evaluation of options by providing a rapid and intuitive assessment of their emotional significance. These markers can guide decision making even before conscious deliberation occurs [16]. The somatic marker system helps individuals prioritize options based on their emotional salience, facilitating efficient decision making.

Overall, somatic markers have a profound influence on decision making by shaping risk perception, biasing reward processing, and facilitating the evaluation of options. Understanding the impact of somatic markers on decision making is crucial for comprehending the complexities of human behavior and has implications for domains such as psychology, neuroscience, and economics.

ROLE OF SOMATIC MARKERS IN RISK PERCEPTION

Somatic markers play a crucial role in the perception of risk, influencing how individuals evaluate and respond to uncertain or risky situations. The integration of emotional signals with bodily responses allows for a more nuanced assessment of potential risks and aids in decision making.

Somatic markers provide a bodily representation of emotional experiences associated with different outcomes, allowing individuals to anticipate the potential positive or negative consequences of their decisions [11]. This process facilitates risk perception by enhancing sensitivity to potential risks and rewards.

Research has shown that individuals with intact somatic marker functioning demonstrate a heightened sensitivity to risky situations. They are more cautious and tend to avoid options associated with potential negative outcomes [12]. In contrast, individuals with impaired somatic marker functioning exhibit deficits in risk perception and are more prone to making risky choices [13].

The role of somatic markers in risk perception is mediated by their interaction with brain regions involved in emotional processing, such as the amygdala and insula. The amygdala facilitates the association between emotionally salient stimuli and the physiological responses that comprise somatic markers, enhancing the encoding and retrieval of emotional memories associated with risk [14]. The insula, known for its role in interoceptive awareness, integrates bodily sensations with emotional states, contributing to the perception of risk [15].

Understanding the role of somatic markers in risk perception has important implications in various domains, such as decision making, finance, and public health. It can help explain individual differences in risk-taking behavior and guide interventions aimed at improving risk perception in situations where accurate risk assessment is critical [16].

In summary, somatic markers play a significant role in risk perception by integrating emotional signals with bodily responses. Their involvement enhances sensitivity to potential risks and rewards, influencing decision making. Further research is needed to unravel the precise mechanisms through which somatic markers contribute to risk perception and how they interact with other cognitive processes involved in decision making.

IMPACT OF SOMATIC MARKERS ON REWARD PROCESSING

Somatic markers play a significant role in the processing and evaluation of rewards, influencing decision-making processes by biasing individuals towards options that are perceived as more beneficial. The integration of emotional signals with bodily responses contributes to the assessment of the value and desirability of different choices.

Positive somatic markers associated with rewarding outcomes bias decision making towards options that are perceived as more advantageous [15]. These markers provide a bodily representation of the emotional experience associated with positive outcomes, enhancing the subjective value attributed to rewards. As a result, individuals are more likely to select options that are associated with positive somatic markers, leading to a greater likelihood of obtaining rewarding outcomes.

Conversely, negative somatic markers serve as warnings, guiding individuals away from options associated with potential negative outcomes [16]. These markers represent the emotional aversion or discomfort associated with negative outcomes, influencing the evaluation of choices. Negative somatic markers contribute to the avoidance of options that are perceived as risky or detrimental, promoting adaptive decision making.

The impact of somatic markers on reward processing is mediated by the interaction between emotional processing regions, such as the amygdala and insula, and higher-order cognitive regions involved in decision making, such as the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) [17]. The amygdala facilitates the encoding and retrieval of emotional memories associated with rewards, while the insula integrates bodily sensations with emotional states, contributing to the assessment of reward value. The vmPFC integrates emotional signals with cognitive processes, guiding decision making based on the overall emotional significance of options.

Understanding the impact of somatic markers on reward processing provides insights into the complexities of decision making and has implications for various fields, including psychology, economics, and consumer behavior. Further research is needed to elucidate the precise mechanisms through which somatic markers influence reward processing and how they interact with other cognitive and neural processes involved in decision making [18].

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Understanding the role of somatic markers in decision making has important clinical implications. Impairments in somatic marker functioning have been linked to various psychiatric disorders, including addiction, impulsive behaviors, and mood disorders. Targeting somatic marker processes through therapeutic interventions may help improve decision-making abilities and promote better outcomes in these populations [19].

THERAPEUTIC INTERVENTIONS TARGETING SOMATIC MARKERS

Developing interventions that specifically target somatic markers could be a promising avenue for clinical practice. Cognitive-behavioral therapies that incorporate somatic marker training may enhance emotional awareness and decision-making skills. Additionally, psychopharmacological interventions that modulate the functioning of neural circuits involved in somatic markers could be explored as potential treatment options [20].

FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN SOMATIC MARKER RESEARCH

Future research should aim to further elucidate the underlying neural mechanisms of somatic markers and their interaction with cognitive processes. Longitudinal studies could provide valuable insights into the developmental trajectories of somatic markers and their impact on decision making across the lifespan. Additionally, investigating individual differences in somatic marker functioning may help identify potential biomarkers for decision-making abilities and susceptibility to psychiatric disorders [15-20].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, somatic markers play a crucial role in behavioral decision making by integrating emotional signals and bodily responses with cognitive processes. The interplay between somatic markers, risk perception, and reward processing influences decision outcomes and shapes our behavior. Understanding the neural mechanisms and theoretical foundations of somatic markers provides valuable insights into the complex nature of decision making and its clinical implications.

The research on somatic markers has shed light on their involvement in various psychiatric disorders and addictive behaviors, suggesting potential avenues for therapeutic interventions. Targeting somatic marker processes through cognitive-behavioral therapies and pharmacological interventions may help improve decision-making abilities and promote better outcomes in individuals with impaired somatic marker functioning.

Future research should focus on further unraveling the underlying neural mechanisms of somatic markers and their interaction with cognitive processes. Longitudinal studies exploring the developmental trajectories of somatic markers across the lifespan would provide valuable insights. Additionally, investigating individual differences in somatic marker functioning could lead to the identification of biomarkers for decision-making abilities and vulnerability to psychiatric disorders.

In conclusion, the integration of somatic markers with cognitive processes is a vital aspect of behavioral decision making. Further research in this field holds the potential to deepen our understanding of decision making, advance clinical interventions, and contribute to the development of strategies for improving decision outcomes in various contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Bechara, A., Damasio, H., & Damasio, A. R. (2000). Emotion, decision making and the orbitofrontal cortex. Cerebral cortex, 10(3), 295-307.
2. Damasio, A. R. (1994). Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain. G.P. Putnam's Sons.
3. Dunn, B. D., Dalgleish, T., & Lawrence, A. D. (2006). The somatic marker hypothesis: a critical evaluation. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 30(2), 239-271.
4. Maia, T. V., & McClelland, J. L. (2004). A reexamination of the evidence for the somatic marker hypothesis: what participants really know in the Iowa gambling task. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 101(45), 16075-16080.
5. Rolls, Example, C., Grabenhorst, F., & Deco, G. (2010). Choice, difficulty, and confidence in the brain. NeuroImage, 53(2), 694-706.
6. Shiv, B., Loewenstein, G., Bechara, A., Damasio, H., & Damasio, A. R. (2005). Investment behavior and the negative side of emotion. Psychological science, 16(6), 435-439.
7. Verleger, R., Wauschkuhn, B., & Hambrecht, F. (2000). Removing a disadvantageous deck does not eliminate the disadvantageous choices in the Iowa Gambling Task. Journal of psychophysiology, 14(3), 231-238.
8. Zahn, R., Moll, J., Krueger, F., Huey, E. D., Garrido, G., & Grafman, J. (2007). Social concepts are represented in the superior anterior temporal cortex. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104(15), 6430-6435.
9. Damasio, A. R., Tranel, D., & Damasio, H. (1990). Individuals with sociopathic behavior caused by frontal damage fail to respond autonomically to social stimuli. Behavioral neuroscience, 104(3), 487-498.
10. Koenigs M, Young L, Adolphs R, Tranel D, Cushman F, Hauser M, Damasio A. Damage to the prefrontal cortex increases utilitarian moral judgements. Nature. 2007 Apr 19;446(7138):908-11. doi: 10.1038/nature05631. Epub 2007 Mar 21. PMID: 17377536; PMCID: PMC2244801..
11. Bechara, A., Tranel, D., & Damasio, H. (2000). Characterization of the decision-making deficit of patients with ventromedial prefrontal cortex lesions. Brain, 123(11), 2189-2202.
12. Hsu, M., Bhatt, M., Adolphs, R., Tranel, D., & Camerer, C. F. (2005). Neural systems responding to degrees of uncertainty in human decision-making. Science, 310(5754), 1680-1683.
13. Critchley, H. D., Mathias, C. J., & Dolan, R. J. (2001). Neural activity in the human brain relating to uncertainty and arousal during anticipation. Neuron, 29(2), 537-545.
14. Bar-On, R., Tranel, D., Denburg, N. L., & Bechara, A. (2003). Exploring the neurological substrate of emotional and social intelligence. Brain, 126(8), 1790-1800.

15. Clark, L., Cools, R., & Robbins, T. W. (2004). The neuropsychology of ventral prefrontal cortex: decision-making and reversal learning. Brain and cognition, 55(1), 41-53.
16. Fellows, L. K., & Farah, M. J. (2003). Ventromedial frontal cortex mediates affective shifting in humans: evidence from a reversal learning paradigm. Brain, 126(8), 1830-1837.
17. Greene, J. D., Nystrom, L. E., Engell, A. D., Darley, J. M., & Cohen, J. D. (2004). The neural bases of cognitive conflict and control in moral judgment. Neuron, 44(2), 389-400.
18. Rolls, E. T. (2005). Emotion Explained. Oxford University Press.
19. Must, A., Horvath, S., Nemeth, V. L., & Janka, Z. (2013). The Iowa Gambling Task in depression - what have we learned about sub-optimal decision-making strategies?. *Frontiers in psychology*, *4*, 732. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00732.
20. Stocco, A., Lebiere, C., & Anderson, J. R. (2010). Conditional routing of information to the cortex: a model of the basal ganglia's role in cognitive coordination. Psychological review, 117(2), 541-574.